D
816
.C48
1942

THE CHURCHES and a JST AND DURABLE PEACE

Handbook for the Use of Classes and Discussion Groups

ealing with the Findings of the Na-ional Study Conference at Delaware, Ohio, March 3-5, 1942, under the auspices of the Commission on a Just and Durable Peace of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America.

Published by
THE CHRISTIAN CENTURY PRESS

1942

D 816 .C48 1942

The churches and a just and durable peace

The communions appointing delegates to the conference were:

American Unitarian Association
National Baptist Convention, U.S.A., Inc.
Northern Baptist Convention
Seventh Day Baptist
Church of the Brethren
Church of the United Brethren in Christ
Congregational and Christian
Disciples of Christ
Protestant Episcopal
Evangelical Church
Evangelical and Reformed
Five Years Meeting of Friends
Friends General Conference
Religious Society of Friends of Philadelphia and Vicinity
American Lutheran Church
Board of Social Missions of the United Lutheran Church in America
National Lutheran Council
English Lutheran Church
Evangelical Lutheran Augustana Synod
Mennonite
Methodist
African Methodist Episcopal Zion
Colored Methodist Episcopal
Moravian
Presbyterian Church in the U. S.
Presbyterian Church in the U.S.A.
Reformed Church in America
Salvation Army
Universalist

LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
JUN 8 1999
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

Concerning This Handbook

This Handbook represents an attempt to present all the *Findings* of the Delaware Conference in such a way as to make them most easily available for discussion purposes in classes, forums, clubs and groups of all kinds.

All the Findings of the Delaware Conference are included, interspersed with comment and questions. These quotations of the Delaware Findings are printed, in almost every instance, in columns slightly narrower—what printers speak of as "indented"—than the main body of comment on them.

The portions of the Handbook's text printed in heavier type—what printers call "bold face"—consist of questions which are designed to stimulate discussion by those using the Handbook.

Principal credit for the preparation of the Handbook goes to Harold E. Fey, of the editorial staff of The Christian Century, although many hands have had a share in its production.

Additional copies of this Handbook, at 15 cents for single copies or 10 cents each in quantities of ten or more, may be obtained from

The Christian Century Press
407 South Dearborn Street, Chicago

THE CHURCHES AND A JUST AND DURABLE PEACE

Chapter One

Introduction

NEARLY four hundred delegates representing the churches cooperating in the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America met in Delaware, Ohio, March 3-5, 1942, in the "National Study Conference of the Churches on a Just and Durable Peace." Careful preparation had been made for this notable conference. Four groups meeting in different parts of the country had each been working for months on one of the four major divisions of the subject into which, for purposes of study, the topic had been divided.[1] The work of these four groups was brought together and guided by the Federal Council's Commission on Study of the Bases of a Just and Durable Peace, which had itself engaged in extensive studies in this field. Long years of study within church circles had further informed the delegates.

So when this group of church leaders met, *Time* magazine quoted Bishop Ivan Lee Holt as saying, "Intellectually this is the most distinguished American church gathering I have seen in thirty years of conference-going." The result, as shown in the published report of the Delaware proceedings, justifies this episcopal encomium.[2] The Delaware Conference made history.

This pamphlet has been prepared to make the monumental labors of these hundreds of church leaders available to every American Christian. The conference will be discussed in thousands of churches throughout America. It is our aim here to present a handbook which will assist that discussion, making the major issues involved more easily visible, and helping to guide group thinking into the constructive channels which the leaders of the church have dug with insight and skill.

---

[1] These four major divisions were "The Churches and a Just and Durable Peace," "The Political Bases of a Just and Durable Peace," "The Economic Bases of a Just and Durable Peace" and "The Social Bases of a Just and Durable Peace."

[2] *The Message of the Delaware Conference*, a pamphlet containing the complete text of all the resolutions and other documents adopted by the conference, may be obtained from the Federal Council of Churches, 297 Fourth Avenue, New York City. Single copies, 10 cents; in quantities of fifty or more, 5 cents each; postage extra.

The attendance at Delaware was strictly limited to delegates appointed by their denominations or other church agencies. Through this handbook to stimulate discussion it will be possible for men and women, old and young, throughout the churches of America to share in the work of the conference. By such widespread discussion we can all make our contribution to the greatest opportunity which today confronts this generation—the making of a just and durable peace.

This discussion is divided into eight sections, or chapters, each complete in itself. Each deals with an important part of the deliberations at Delaware. Other pertinent material bearing on the issues under consideration appears in places where it will help make the issues clear, but the principal source of material for discussion is in each case the Delaware findings. This handbook is prepared and published at this time so that Christian leaders and their churches may at the earliest possible moment use it in groups or classes which are considering this greatest of all problems.

Nobody is wise enough to know when peace may come. However, we may all be certain that the time to begin to prepare for it is now. No matter how long the interval may be before peace returns to earth, we may be certain that it will be too short to obtain a full understanding of all the issues that are at stake, and over which men are now fighting and dying. Adequate preparation to face the problems with which peace will confront the people of America, who will have to bear great responsibilities for the future, will surely take more time than we have. But we can at least begin at once.

Why Talk About Peace Before We Win the War?

THIS QUESTION is raised by many people whose concern about the immediate present causes them to forget what happened at the end of the last war. They reason that thoughts of peace are a hindrance to a nation engaged in the vast effort of total war. They further hold that until the outcome of the war is known, it is a waste of time to discuss terms which we may never have the opportunity to impose on the nations against which we are fighting.

In calling together this great gathering of church leaders at Delaware, the Federal Council's Commission on the Bases of a Just and Durable Peace was not forgetful of these points. But it recognized that, sooner or later, war must end. Then nations will choose representatives to sit down together in a peace conference. They will have to arrive at some kind of agreement on "the shape of things to come." The decision

they reach will be vastly important for us all. Immediate problems of tremendous import will be pressing for a speedy decision. Food for the starving, medical care for the wounded and suffering, shelter for the homeless, reconstruction for wrecked cities and the ruined business life of many nations, great social unrest—these will all clamor for attention. The way in which such problems are handled may easily have as much influence on the future as the fixing of political boundaries.

First, therefore, it needs to be understood that if the proper basis is not laid in the midst of war for that future peace, another war will come as the present one came. If the treaty-makers of 1919 could have looked ahead to 1939, can there be any doubt that they would have made different peace terms in order to guard against the present plight of humanity?

Second, a wise and just peace policy will in itself prove a powerful asset in winning the war. In every country, but particularly in Great Britain and Russia, there has been a powerful public opinion demanding a more explicit definition of the purposes for which the United Nations are now fighting. The Atlantic Charter, drawn up by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill during their famous meeting on a battleship off Newfoundland in August 1941, was a step in that direction. In general principles it addressed itself particularly to the post-war objectives of the United Nations. Those general objectives need to be examined, amplified and critically analyzed.

Regardless of who wins the war, or whether anybody wins it, it is fundamental that certain broad principles be written into the peace or it cannot endure. Christians should know what these principles are.

Third, we should study the bases of a just and enduring peace because it is certain that the United States will have a far more definite responsibility at the end of the war for other people than it has ever before acknowledged. Our nation has never carried the degree of responsibility that we should as the most powerful and wealthy member of the world comunity. This does not refer particularly to our refusal to enter the League of Nations in 1919 or the World Court then or later. It refers to the way in which we have too often wielded our vast economic power without regard to the welfare of other peoples, to the provincialism which characterizes all great continental communities and to our ignorance of the needs of people who are affected for good or ill by our acts.

Fourth, our government must have behind it an informed public opinion if it is to receive the public support it will need

for an intelligent international policy when the war is over and the peace is to be signed. It will need that opinion as a support for policies which may look toward peace but which may again be opposed by the Clemenceaus and Lloyd Georges of a new Versailles.

Finally, nothing has happened or can happen which removes from the Christian church its obligation to give itself to the ministry of reconciliation among men. The Delaware Conference expressed this conviction in the eleventh of the thirteen "Guiding Principles" which it adopted at the outset of the conference. "We believe that a supreme responsibility rests with the church," it said. "The church, being a creation of God in Jesus Christ, is called to proclaim to all men everywhere the way of life. Moreover, the church, which is now in reality a world community, may be used of God to develop his spirit of righteousness and love in every race and nation and thus to make possible a just and durable peace. For this service Christians must now dedicate themselves, seeking forgiveness for their sins and the constant guidance and help of God."

What this means to Christians as citizens was expressed in the twelfth principle adopted at Delaware: *"We believe that, as Christian citizens, we must seek to translate our beliefs into practical realities and to create a public opinion which will insure that the United States shall play its full and essential part in the creation of a moral way of international living. We must strive within the life of our own nation for change which will result in the more adequate application here of the principles above enumerated as the basis of a just and durable world order."*

What Have the Churches Done to End War?

THE Delaware Conference was probably as representative a conference as the churches of America have ever held. Among its 377 members were leaders of every major denomination and of a great many smaller churches. In addition, many city federations of churches were represented, as well as the general interchurch agencies of American Protestantism. The pronouncements of this conference were democratically drawn up and adopted after full discussion within smaller groups and before the conference as a whole. While the conference was speaking only for its own members, the way in which its findings were adopted insured, therefore, that they represent the best thought of the churches of Christ in

America in their determination to end war before war ends civilization.

Back of this conference were many others. At Philadelphia in February 1940, a similar study conference of the churches met. The British churches held a historic meeting at Malvern in 1941 which dealt with the same problem. The World Conference of Churches, convened at Oxford, England, in 1937, devoted much of its time to the issues with which war confronts the Christian church throughout the world. So also did the conference of the International Missionary Council which assembled at Madras, India, at the close of 1938. And at the World Conference of Christian Youth which met at Amsterdam, Holland, just before the outbreak of the war in 1939, this responsibility of Christianity for peace was a principal theme of discussion.

These are only a few of the great national and international conferences of the church which have dealt with this greatest of issues in the modern world. Innumerable other meetings have wrestled with it in national denominational assemblies, in youth conferences, in mission meetings. For years it has been the recurrent theme of sermons, of study courses, of forums. Indeed, Walter W. Van Kirk, secretary of the Department of International Justice and Good Will of the Federal Council of Churches and secretary of the Delaware Conference, said recently that the churches are the only group in American life with any adequate training in thinking in international terms or in dealing with the spiritual forces which must be evoked in the building of a new world.

But this is not a problem whose discussion should be confined to great national or international gatherings. Because it affects every one of us—our lives, our homes, our children, our means of earning a livelihood, our future hopes, "all that we are or have or hope to be"—it needs to be discussed by every one of us. In every church we should be gathering, in our various church societies, in classes in our church schools or in the increasingly popular "church nights," or in special groups brought together for this particular purpose, to carry this discussion forward. Nothing could do more to guard against the danger of winning the war and losing the peace than to have it known that millions of American Christians were meeting in their churches to make up their minds, by common counsel and study, as to what the nature of the coming peace should be. This is already happening in a good many churches, but not yet in enough. That is why it is so important that it should happen in *your* church, and that *you* should have a part in it.

Federal Government Planning For Peace

WHILE its present energies are all apparently being thrown into the waging of total war, it is significant that the government of the United States is also working on the problem of peace. At least a half-dozen agencies in Washington are giving all or a large part of their time to dealing with the issues which will confront the country as soon as the fighting ceases.

One reason why the government is making these plans for what to do when the firing stops is, of course, that nobody knows when the war may be over. It may end as suddenly as did the First World War. With a large share of our population then engaged in serving the machines of war production, we shall immediately face an economic crisis of unparalleled magnitude in our own country. What shall we do about it? Some of the government's planning commissions are working on that.

Multiply that prospect in America by the problems of a like nature in all the countries at war and you will see the condition of world affairs which is occupying the men in Washington who have been asked to be ready "when peace breaks out." For the United States will not only have to carry its own burdens but will also have to help other nations, including those who are now our enemies, to bear theirs.

Questions for General Discussion

Because this first chapter in this handbook is simply an introduction to help you become acquainted with the Delaware Conference, telling what it was and why it was, it is impossible to suggest topics for group discussion which are based on the Findings adopted by that conference. Discussion of that kind will begin with Chapter Two. However, here are some questions that your group should think about even before it starts to consider the Delaware resolutions.

1. What is meant when it is said that the United States may "win the war and lose the peace"?
2. What aims did the United States have in the First World War which were not achieved at the peace conference? Why did the United States fail to achieve its objectives at the peace conference?

3. What was the cost of the First World War—in lives? In property? Will the Second be more or less destructive than the First?
4. Have Christian churches any special responsibility for the nature of the peace which will follow the present war? If your answer is in the affirmative, what do you think that responsibility is?
5. Can you draw up a list of ten major international problems with which the coming peace conference will have to deal? Concerning which of these should the Christian churches have something to say?
6. Do you believe that it would be possible for Christians of the United States and the British Commonwealth of Nations to frame proposals for a peace to follow the present war to which Christians of Germany and Japan would agree? If such agreement proved impossible, what likelihood would there be that such a peace would be either just or durable?
7. Do you agree that the churches have done more to create an informed public opinion on peace issues than any other group in America? If not, what other institution or group do you think has done more?

To Aid in Discussion

Every member of the discussion group should obtain a copy of

The Message of the Delaware Conference. A pamphlet containing the complete text of all the reports adopted and other actions taken at the Conference on the Bases of a Just and Durable Peace, held at Delaware, Ohio, March 3-5, 1942. This may be obtained from the Federal Council of Churches, 297 Fourth Avenue, New York City, at the very low price of 10 cents for single copies and 5 cents each for quantities of 50 or more. Postage extra. This is the basic document which should be in the hands of every Christian in America.

For a mind-awakening introduction to the whole question of what part the Christian churches should play in the writing of the coming peace and in the making of a new international order that will follow, there is nothing available as good as

Religion and the World of Tomorrow, by Walter W.

Van Kirk. This book by the secretary of the Federal Council's Commission on International Justice and Good Will, who also acted as secretary of the Delaware Conference, is published by Willett, Clark & Company, 37 W. Van Buren St., Chicago, Ill., contains 150 pages, and costs only $1.50. Every leader of a group discussing the Delaware Conference should have a copy of Dr. Van Kirk's book constantly at hand. It would be a good idea to buy another copy for circulation generally among the members of the group.

Then may we make one closing suggestion? Let the leader, or someone designated by your group, take up with your local library the question of making available additional reading material to help you with your discussion. Almost all librarians will be glad to inform groups engaged in a study of such importance as this concerning the books, magazines and other printed materials bearing on problems of the coming peace which are in the libraries which they administer. Immensely helpful aid of this sort can thus be obtained at no additional expense.

Chapter Two

Christian Principles Underlying A Just and Durable Peace

DOES the Christian church have a special contribution to make to peace? The Delaware Conference believed that it has. It based that belief on its conviction that the church is the trustee of certain principles without which peace is impossible. It owes it to our nation and to the world to make those principles clear. What are they?

I—Human Interdependence and Christian Truth

PEACE will depend upon the cooperation of men in all lands. Consequently, it must be based on commonly accepted principles which all men, Christian and non-Christian alike, will freely accept. The rise of the machine age has made the people of each country dependent in greater or less degree upon the people of every other. Who would have imagined, for example, that within a few months

events happening thousands of miles away could overnight take tens of thousands of American automobiles off the roads and streets? Since the automobile was the one supreme symbol of the superior American standard of living, the loss, even if temporary, of so many vehicles provides a striking if painful demonstration of the interdependence of modern nations.

II—Moral Laws in the Everyday World

OUR SCIENTIFIC AGE has been giving itself to the discovery of the laws of the world of physics and chemistry. It has discovered that there is a reason for all things, that nothing happens by caprice or accident. The study of these laws and their combination has made possible the marvelous advances of technological civilization. To use these laws rightly is happiness; to defy them is disaster.

The Delaware Conference believed that there is an inner law which is as binding as any law which can be observed at work in a physics laboratory. It said:

> We believe that moral law, no less than physical law, undergirds our world. There is a moral order which is fundamental and eternal, and which is relevant to the corporate life of men and the ordering of human society. If mankind is to escape chaos and recurrent war, social and political institutions must be brought into conformity with this moral order.

This moral law is not an American law, or an English or a Chinese law. It applies equally to all men. Instead of being printed in statute books, it is written, as the ancient prophet said, in our hearts. It is a part of the nature of man. If we acknowledge it and obey it, we live together in peace. If we ignore it and defy it, we die together in war.

What is the essence of this moral law? Perhaps it has never been summed up more briefly or accurately than it was by St. Paul when he said, "We are members one of another" (Eph. 4:25). "The eye cannot say to the hand, I have no need of thee: or again the head to the feet, I have no need of you" (I Cor. 12:21). The Delaware Conference had this fundamental Christian teaching in mind when it went on to say:

> We believe that the sickness and suffering which afflict our present society are proof of indifference to, as well as direct violation of, the moral law. All share in responsibility for the present evils. There is none who does not

need forgiveness. A mood of genuine penitence is therefore demanded of us—individuals and nations alike.

Confession of wrongs done and penitence for sins committed is right for an individual. Is it wrong for nations? Gandhi recently asked Great Britain openly to confess the harm that she had done India by her policies of imperialism. He declared that without such penitence, British-Indian relations could never return to the right basis.

Was Gandhi mistaken? What does the United States have to repent of? Is it enough to express penitence in general, or do we need to be specific? What about the Japanese Exclusion Act? What about our laws excluding all Asiatics from citizenship?

Is retaliation right when we feel that we have suffered great wrongs? Dr. William Temple, the present Archbishop of Canterbury, when he was Archbishop of York, declared that at the end of the war there must be a period of "retributive justice." For a period of perhaps five years he held that the defeated Axis powers should be made to suffer some of the hardships they are now causing others to undergo. During this time they would be disarmed as they were at the end of the First World War and the victors would "police the peace." Then when the passions of war had subsided and the German and Italian and Japanese people had presumably become duly penitent, a peace conference would be held at which all would sit down as equals and a peace would be drafted that would have a chance of permanence.

It will be argued, of course, that there is a difference between "retaliation" and "retribution"; that the second contains a moral quality which the first lacks. But does this distinction actually hold good in practical affairs? Or do we tend to defend as "retribution" what the other fellow feels is a plain case of "retaliation"? Even in the case of such a notable church leader as the Archbishop of Canterbury, a reading of his book, *The Hope of a New World,* in which he talks about what should be done to Germany after the war, shows that when it comes to this five-year period of "retributive justice," he thinks that it must have a definite "penal quality." How would that fit in with the declaration of the Delaware Conference:

> We believe that it is contrary to the moral order that nations in their dealings with one another should be motivated by a spirit of revenge and retaliation. Such attitudes will lead, as they always have led, to renewed conflict.

III—The Search for a World Community

IF THERE IS one moral law under which all men must live, then there should also be a sense among men that they are parts of one community. Church leaders are far more clear on this point than they were at the end of the First World War. Not only must there be one community, but that community must be provided with organizations and accepted methods through which the common concerns of the moral law to provide for the welfare of all mankind can find expression. This is what the Delaware Conference said on that point:

> We believe that the principle of cooperation and mutual concern, implicit in the moral order and essential to a just and durable peace, calls for a true community of nations. The interdependent life of nations must be ordered by agencies having the duty and the power to promote and safeguard the general welfare of all peoples. Only thus can wrongs be righted and justice and security be achieved. A world of irresponsible, competing and unrestrained national sovereignties, whether acting alone or in alliance or in coalition, is a world of international anarchy. It must make place for a higher and more inclusive authority.

Here we face one of the most difficult, but most important, problems of the modern world. It is the problem of what is called "national sovereignty." Nations insist that they are "sovereign"—by which they mean that they are their own bosses, that they will allow no one else to tell them what they are to do, and that they will do as they please, both with their own people and in their relations with other peoples. This "national sovereignty" is generally recognized as one of the most prolific causes of trouble between nations, and consequent war.

Until some international agency is set up to decide the disputes between nations, or until nations are willing to put a large part of their international relations under the control of international bodies which act on the principle of "the greatest good to the greatest number" rather than on that of "each for himself, and the devil take the hindmost," what has been called our "international anarchy" leading to war will continue.

But do you think that the United States will consent to give any international body control of matters over which we are now sovereign? Will this country permit such a body, for example, to have any say about our

tariffs, no matter what those tariffs may do to the people of Czechoslovakia or Argentina? Will it permit any such body to tell us how many troops we may have in our army, or how many battleships in our navy? *Should* the United States consent to international control in such matters? If your answer is "No," then ask just one more question: Should Germany?

In individual disputes, it is a commonly accepted principle that no man is competent to be the judge in his own case. Impartial third-party judgment is sought. **Is the powerful United States prepared to accept this principle at the end of the war?** Secretary Knox of the navy has said that we will never again deliver battleships to be sunk by international agreement as a part of a program of general disarmament. Yet there can be no surrender of sovereignty unless there is a surrender of armaments. **Who was right—the Delaware Conference or the secretary of the navy?**

This problem of political sovereignty grows tougher the farther you get into it. A group that can get past this issue in a discussion of this kind without frayed tempers or even coming to the brink of dissolution is one which practices rare discipline and is guided by real skill.

But political sovereignty—by which is meant a nation's control over its political interests and decisions—is not the whole problem. Even if nations should yield some of their political sovereignty to an international body, the causes of disputes leading to wars would remain.

A principal source of such disputes is economic. To provide the material basis for a decent and prosperous standard of living, nations must have access to the raw materials out of which modern industry can fashion the goods or package the food which their people require. The Delaware Conference recognized this fact. It therefore added to its statement of principles the following:

> We believe that economic security is no less essential than political security to a just and durable peace. Such security nationally and internationally involves among other things the use of material resources and the tools of production to raise the general standard of living. Nations are not economically self-sufficient, and the natural wealth of the world is not evenly distributed. Accordingly the possession of such natural resources should not be looked upon as an opportunity to promote national advantage or to enhance the prosperity of some at the expense of others. Rather such possession is a trust to be discharged in the general interest. This calls for more than an

offer to sell to all on equal terms. Such an offer may be a futile gesture unless those in need can, through the selling of their own goods and services, acquire the means of buying. The solution of this problem, doubtless involving some international organization, must be accepted as a responsibility by those who possess natural resources needed by others.

It is suggested that the discussion of this point will gain realism if it is carried on in relation to some concrete commodity. An example is oil.

Did the United States do right in supplying Japan with oil and gasoline up to within a few weeks of the outbreak of war? Would it have been better for China and for world peace if there had been some international body controlling the distribution of the world's supply of petroleum to which Japan could have turned to fill its oil needs? How many of the major battlefields or military objectives of this war have also been important oil fields? Do you see any particular significance in this, or is it just a coincidence without importance? How do you think this problem can be dealt with after the war to eliminate the danger of future wars for the control of war supplies?

IV—Four Freedoms or Six—Or How Many?

IN THE LIGHT of the fact that President Roosevelt has repeatedly spoken of "four freedoms" as essential, it is instructive to discover that the churchmen at Delaware demanded six:

> We believe that the right of all men to pursue work of their own choosing and to enjoy security from want and oppression is not limited by race, color or creed. The rights and liberties of racial and religious minorities in all lands should be recognized and safeguarded. Freedom of religious worship, of speech and assembly, of the press, and of scientific inquiry and teaching are fundamental to human development and in keeping with the moral order.

President Roosevelt's "four freedoms" are freedom of speech and of religion, freedom from want and from fear. **How do the "six freedoms" of Delaware differ? If you were making up a list of freedoms essential to a decent world order and a lasting peace, would it be like Presi-**

dent Roosevelt's or like that of the Delaware Conference? Or would you extend both?

If what happened after the First World War is any indication, we may expect that this present world war will be followed by revolutions in many countries. To forestall such upheavals, which often destroy more than they save, it is essential that methods of peaceful change be made available to the desperate peoples who may otherwise turn to bloody methods of righting what they conceive to be their wrongs. Therefore included by the Delaware Conference in the principles which are essential to peace was this:

> We believe that international machinery is required to facilitate the easing of such economic and political tensions as are inevitably recurrent in a world which is living and therefore changing. Any attempt to freeze an order of society by inflexible treaty specifications is bound, in the long run, to jeopardize the peace of mankind. Nor must it be forgotten that refusal to assent to needed change may be as immoral as the attempt by violent means to force such change.

Now it is one thing to affirm that as a general principle, but another to give it specific application. However, without the specific application it is not worth much. So ask some specific questions:

How are you going to give a defeated Germany and Japan security of access to iron, oil, tin and other essentials after the war? Or to come closer home, how are you going to resolve the objections of land speculators and real estate interests to the vast housing program which will be the only way to avoid widespread unemployment and social unrest in the United States after the war? And in a larger area, how are you going to fix it so that if Germany (or Japan) thinks the coming treaty is unfair, it will not have to rearm or go to war to change it, as it did in the case of the Treaty of Versailles?

V—The Future of Colonies

WHEN we think of building a durable peace, we consider chiefly the present disturbers of the peace—Germany, Italy and Japan. Sometimes you have heard them called the "have-not nations." But behind them there are still other peoples, vaster still in numbers and in potential power. These might be called the "ultimate have-nots."

India, with 388,000,000 people, has become the center of war, and she wants her freedom. China, with anywhere from 450,000,000 to 500,000,000 people, has lost vast territories to both Russia and Japan. Her government is driven into her western mountains, but it demands that the "territorial and administrative integrity of China" be observed. The peoples of the British, French and Dutch empires have their rights, although Mr. Churchill once told Parliament that the Atlantic Charter did not apply to India or Burma. The people newly subjugated by Japan and Germany have their rights. **What are we going to do about them?**

The Delaware Conference declared:

> We believe that that government which derives its just powers from the consent of the governed is the truest expression of the rights and dignity of man. This requires that we seek autonomy for all subject and colonial peoples. Until that shall be realized, the task of colonial government is no longer one of exclusive national concern. It must be recognized as a common responsibility of mankind, to be carried out in the interests of the colonial peoples by the most appropriate form of organization. This would, in many cases, make colonial government a task of international collaboration for the benefit of colonial peoples who would, themselves, have a voice in their government. As the agencies for the promotion of world-wide political and economic security become effective, the moral, social and material welfare of colonial populations can be more fully realized.

VI—Who Shall Be Disarmed?

THE ATLANTIC CHARTER, written in August 1941 by President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill, declared its belief that all nations "must come to the abandonment of the use of force." This was probably the most important, as it was certainly the most Christian, statement in that whole document. Nevertheless, the Atlantic Charter went on to proclaim that, "pending the establishment of a wider and permanent system of general security," the aggressor nations alone would be disarmed. Since this is the most authoritative statement of war aims yet made by the heads of the two countries involved, it is assumed that this represents the present policy of the United States and Great Britain.

Such a policy as this regarding the fundamental issue of disarmament is inadequate for many reasons. It offers no hope

of release from the burden of armament taxation which is too heavy to be carried forever by any people, even the supposedly "rich" people of the United States. It ignores the fact that armed strength is today as much a matter of potential—that is to say, of a nation's productive capacity—as of actual armaments. And it further ignores the practical probability that if four nations after the war try to hold all the arms they will simply succeed in driving all the other nations into a combination against them, which through intrigue will finally break up the coalition of the armed and then will go back to the old game which Germany played with such terrible effectiveness against France and England after 1920. Don't forget that Germany was stripped of her navy, her army reduced to 100,000 men and she was forbidden to have an airforce by the treaty of 1919.

The Delaware Conference went far beyond the Atlantic Charter when it declared:

> We believe that military establishments should be internationally controlled and be made subject to law under the community of nations. For one or more nations to be forcibly deprived of their arms while other nations retain the right of maintaining or expanding their military establishments can only produce an uneasy peace for a limited period. Any initial arrangement which falls short of this must therefore be looked upon as temporary and provisional.

Do you believe that a lasting peace requires general disarmament among the nations? On what basis do you think it would be safe for the United States to disarm after the war? If some sort of international police force should be proposed following the war, would you favor committing the security of the United States to protection by such a force?

One of the beliefs on which the delegates to the Delaware Conference were most agreed was that the United States has followed policies in the past which have had much to do with keeping the world in turmoil, and that it is therefore necessary for the people of the United States to begin now to study such trouble-breeding policies in order to see how they must be changed in the future. This was what lay behind the adoption of this principle:

> We believe that, in bringing international relations into conformity with the moral law, a very heavy responsibility devolves upon the United States. For at least a generation we have held preponderant economic power in the world, and with it the capacity to influence decisively

the shaping of world events. It should be a matter of shame and humiliation to us that actually the influences shaping the world have largely been irresponsible forces. Our own positive influence has been impaired because of concentration on self and on our short-range material gains. Many of the major preconditions of a just and durable peace require changes of national policy on the part of the United States. Among such may be mentioned: equal access to natural resources, economic collaboration, equitable treatment of racial minorities, international control of tariffs, limitation of armaments, participation in world government. We must be ready to subordinate immediate and particular national interests to the welfare of all. If the future is to be other than a repetition of the past, the United States must accept the responsibility for constructive action commensurate with its power and opportunity.

Is there any part of this declaration with which you disagree? If so, how would you reword it?

All of this puts a heavy responsibility upon the church.

In consequence of the prophetic tradition of biblical religion, and in loyalty to the words of Jesus Christ himself, it is the function of the church to "discern" the times and the seasons, to "decipher the meaning" of each succeeding era and to bear witness to the word and will of God in each concrete situation. In doing so the church will issue a call to repentance in which both church and nation shall acknowledge their separate and corporate guilt before God.

Consequently:

We believe that a supreme responsibility rests with the church. The church, being a creation of God in Jesus Christ, is called to proclaim to all men everywhere the way of life. Moreover, the church which is now in reality a world community, may be used of God to develop his spirit of righteousness and love in every race and nation and thus to make possible a just and durable peace. For this service Christians must now dedicate themselves, seeking forgiveness for their sins and the constant guidance and help of God.

Probably most of those in the Christian churches of America will agree with these two declarations. *Do you?* If so, might it not be well to end this particular period of discussion by asking:

What do we mean when we say that we must seek forgiveness for our sins? What sins—just sins in general, or some specific sins that we can identify and name? And how shall we seek forgiveness—simply by expressing contrition, or are there acts of contrition to be performed which will show that our repentance is real and goes deep into our lives?

Chapter Three

The Churches and a Just and Durable Peace

"THE CHURCHES, which in themselves transcend national frontiers, have a peculiar responsibility to help expand men's loyalties to include the whole number of the children of our Heavenly Father and the world government required by their common needs." These words of the first American Study Conference on the Churches and the International Situation, which was held in Philadelphia in 1940, expressed a concern which had become widespread among the churches long before the outbreak of the war.

The shadow of the present war was no bigger than a man's hand when this concern began to take tangible shape in the churches of this and other countries. By the middle of the 1920's it had begun to be felt in international church gatherings held at Lausanne and Stockholm. The second World Missionary Conference held at Jerusalem in 1928 bore witness to the deep conviction of Christians of many lands that wars must cease and that the church must do its part to bring peace. During the remaining decade of "the long armistice" this conviction grew; it found expression in thousands of resolutions by national and other church bodies, in innumerable sermons and books, and in all the teaching of the church. It reached its climax in the years just before the outbreak of war in four remarkable gatherings of representatives of the churches.

Beginning with the World Conference on the Life and Work of the Churches, which was held at Oxford, England, in July 1937, they included the Conference on Faith and Order, at Edinburgh, Scotland, in the same year, the third World Conference of the International Missionary Council, held at Madras, India, in 1938 and the first World Conference of

Christian Youth, held in Amsterdam, Holland, just before the outbreak of the war. In each of these world assemblies, the Christian leaders of the major countries of the world gave careful study to the international tensions which even then threatened to divide their nations into hostile camps. No subject was more often the theme of the prayers which these assemblies carried to the throne of grace in united worship. Whatever may have been the case in the past, the churches of Christ throughout the world cannot be accused of having allowed this war to approach unseen.

When the leaders of American Protestantism met to discuss a just and durable peace at Delaware, Ohio, in March 1942 in the second national study conference, they were therefore carrying forward a process which had gained years of momentum in this and other countries. The concern of the churches with right relations between nations is not merely an emergency response to the present world crisis but a sustained and powerful movement which springs from the very heart of the Christian faith.

I—The Responsibility of the Church

THE CHURCH has the obligation to bear its witness to the truth as it is in God whether anybody pays attention to it or not. Nevertheless it is not the negligible influence in our national life which some would like to believe. The 36,000,000 members of the 150,000 Protestant churches in America constitute a mighty force. The 21,000,000 Roman Catholics in this country, whose hierarchy has commanded them to raise unceasing prayers for peace, must also be taken into account. While its potential power may be only partially brought to bear, the church has responsibility before God to use its power for good will.

The Delaware Conference was keenly sensitive to this obligation. The first of the four major subdivisions of the conference considered the role of the church in this situation. This division of the conference was the largest of all. It began its report as follows:

> We believe it is the purpose of God to create a world-wide community in Jesus Christ, transcending nation, race and class. The Christian church, accordingly, is responsible not only to proclaim the divine message, but also to contribute by all the means in its power, to secure a world order in which God shall have his rightful place, and the basic needs of mankind shall be satisfied. In the

present crisis this responsibility of the church is made more manifest than ever before. It therefore becomes its inescapable duty to speak both to its own members and to the leaders of our political, economic and cultural life concerning what seems to it to be the will of God for the peaceful ordering of human life.

It is significant that the famous conference of representatives of the Church of England which was held at Malvern, January 7-10, 1941, took a similar view. They held that "because the church is not an association of men gathered together by the act of their own wills, but is the creation of God in Jesus Christ, through which as his body Christ carries on his work for men, it has the duty and the right to speak not only to its members but to the world concerning the true principles of human life. The first and if fully understood the whole duty of the church is to be in very deed the church—the community of the spirit drawing men and nations into itself, that they may become sharers in its God-given life and so fulfill their several destinies according to God's purpose. . . . The war is not to be regarded as an isolated evil detached from the general condition of Western civilization during the last period. Rather it is to be seen as one symptom of a widespread disease and maladjustment resulting from loss of conviction concerning the reality and character of God, and the true nature and destiny of man."

II—Preaching Is Not Enough

THE Delaware Conference was keenly sensitive to the necessity which is upon the church to recall the admonition: "Physician, heal thyself!" It declared:

> In order that its witness may be effective in the fullest measure, it is important that the church reflect in every phase of its own life—congregational, denominational, interdenominational and ecumenical—the reality of the peace, unity and cooperation which it recommends to secular society.

The last religious census showed that the number of denominations in the United States is growing, having now reached 256. There are eight national interchurch agencies to carry on the interdenominational work of the churches where one should suffice. Nevertheless there is a growing movement toward unity. The world-wide ecumenical movement has progressed to the place where there are now more than 75

communions who are members of the World Council of Churches. **In what ways in your own community does the church bear witness to the peace and cooperation which it recommends to the nations?**

The unique service which the church can render to the peace of the world is its ministry of prayer. The Delaware Conference said:

> Conscious also of its helplessness apart from God, and of the infinite resources which it has in God for the supply of every need, the church is called upon to a new ministry of prayer in order that God's saving power may become manifest amid the complexity and tragedy of our life.

What do you think of the value of the prayers for peace which have been offered in all Catholic churches since the outbreak of the war? Should we pray for peace, or victory, or simply for the will of God to be done? What kind of prayers do you suppose Japanese and German Christians are offering?

III—The Church Must Act First!

NOT SINCE the days of the religious wars have the churches carried their differences to the point where nations now carry their conflicts. But the divisions still run deep and are a standing reproach when the church attempts to counsel others. Delaware realized this keenly. It confessed:

> We are penitently conscious of the many weaknesses and shortcomings of the church itself in the face of the tremendous responsibilities with which it is confronted. We have not sufficiently borne witness to, nor even adequately recognized for the church itself, that very unity of mankind, beyond race and nation, which again and again we have declared in principle.
>
> We call upon our churches, therefore, to enter seriously and immediately upon the task of breaking down the barriers that so easily divide us into opposing groups. We would say to them: If you believe in peace for the world, if you are working for cooperation between nations, governments, races and peoples under the Fatherhood of God, you must set the example for such reconciliation and cooperation. The Christian churches must come to realize as they now do not, that joining the Church of

Christ in any of its branches means entering a fellowship world-wide in extent, beyond denomination and race, and should involve responsible participation in the task of making spiritually more real our mystical fellowship in community life and in the world.

What churches which divided over the Civil War have recently reunited? What effect do local church mergers have in the movement for Christian unity?

The Delaware Conference urged that the churches extend the cooperation between themselves.

> We would also call upon our churches to enter upon a new era of interdenominational cooperation in which the claims of cooperative effort should be placed, so far as possible, before denominational prestige, and that conjoint Christian efforts be not weakened or imperiled by our several denominational allegiances.

Time magazine, commenting upon the conference, pointed out that the conference recommended that governments *unite* in a world government, but confined itself to advising the churches merely to *cooperate* more closely. **Was that a fair criticism? Does the close and growing cooperation between the churches provide the equivalent of unity, keeping the advantages of diversity?**

IV—Deeper Level Of Unity

YET in spite of this, there is a deeper level of unity. On this level the church has much to give to a world which will destroy itself unless it finds the road to a just and durable peace. The Delaware Conference was speaking in the realm of faith when it said:

> We declare as the major premise that the church is a spiritual entity, one and indivisible, which as such is not and cannot be broken by human conflicts. Therefore the church is in a unique position to heal the wounds of war and bind the world together in a just and durable peace. We recognize the particular rights and responsibilities of the state in connection with the secular order. But we reaffirm the Christian truth that the church in its essential nature is an ecumenical, supranational body, separate from and independent of all states, including our own national state. The spiritual responsibilities of the church and the spiritual service

which it may render derive not from the claims which the state may make but from the freedom and autonomy of the church itself under the Lord Jesus Christ who is its Living Head.

The Delaware Conference provided an example of the reconciliation it urged on others. On the one hand there were those who asked the conference to say: "The church is not at war." They wanted to make clear that the business of the church is the eternal task of the worship of God and the reconciliation of men to him and to each other. The Oxford Conference slogan, "Let the church be the church!" applies now, they held. On the other hand, many desired to put the conference on record as endorsing the war policies of the United States government, or in declaring that the cause of the United Nations is a holy cause, or as calling the churches to give themselves wholeheartedly to some phase of the war effort. On vote of its steering committee, composed of leaders of both points of view, resolutions of both kinds were ruled out. To permit either to gain the floor, it was held, would reduce the conference to a debate on the war and would defeat the purpose which the conference met to achieve, which was to discuss peace. To this both sides consented and the conference proceeded.

V—What Can Be Done Now?

THE Delaware Conference concluded its discussion of the principles relating the churches to building a just and durable peace with this suggestion:

> We believe that each local church will do much to create the mood out of which a just and durable peace can grow, and make its own message of Christian brotherhood real to itself and its constituency, if it will give itself to specific acts of service and reconciliation within its own community.
>
> The practice of acts of interracial good will, aid and friendship for new Americans, assistance to refugees and to bewildered but innocent aliens, a ministry to the victims of war at home and abroad—these and other such immediate acts of helpfulness will be the best educational experience for the church group itself and will build the community attitudes upon which the peace we seek may later come.

On this point the Malvern Conference was even more ex-

plicit. It recognized that while a local congregation might not be ready to move forward, a small group within the congregation might. The term "cells," as Malvern used it, refers to such a group. Usually it is a group of from three to twelve people, meeting regularly once a week or oftener for prayer, work and study, and wholly committed to a common purpose. The Malvern Conference urged the formation of such little fellowships throughout the church. It is pointed out that Jesus started with such a little group of "disciples" or learners; that every great movement begins as such a group. The Malvern meeting, of which the present Archbishop of Canterbury was chairman, said: "Besides such cells there should be groups of people not ready as yet to join in Christian devotion, but who come together to study and discuss what is the Christian way of life for them and for society. Many have been led by this to ask for instruction in doctrine and prayer. In all such schemes, the Christian people of a district should combine to show a true neighborliness, as this is illuminated by the parable of the Good Samaritan."

The Delaware Conference approved a number of recommendations for action to the central agencies of the churches. If you care to study these, see the pamphlet on *The Message of the Delaware Conference,* prepared by the Federal Council. We suggest that the organization of a Committee for a Just and Durable Peace in the local church is the first step toward larger service to this cause. Such committees can get excellent advice from the Federal Council of Churches, Department of International Justice and Good Will, 297 Fourth Avenue, New York.

Chapter Four

The Political Bases of a Just and Durable Peace

AT THE END of the war, when the armies have come to rest and the navies have finished their last assignment, representatives of governments will meet to define the political terms on which the peoples of the world will again attempt to live with one another. If, as often happens, the defeated nations have overthrown their present governments, other men will be chosen, if not to negotiate, then to be present to receive the terms which are handed down. Since it took five sets of treaties to end the First World War, and then

the Washington conference of 1922 had to meet to take care of unfinished business in parts of the world which had been omitted, so this time it may be necessary to draft many agreements to care for the vast complex of needs which must be provided for in some way. Altogether this task will represent the most difficult political assignment undertaken by any group of men in all history.

If the past offers a precedent, large areas on the map of the world will be redrawn. Whether the arbitrament reached is imposed by force or is achieved by negotiation, it will be necessary to decide what will be done about the peoples of vast areas, some now self-governing and others which are not yet ready for self-rule. The peace conference will legislate on what terms and in what channels trade is to be carried on again, what will be the relationship between currencies of the various countries, whether penalties will be imposed on the vanquished and what kind. Such a conference or series of conferences will decide what nations will retain their arms and which ones will be disarmed, or whether an international authority will be set up which alone will possess armaments.

It is not difficult to see that the political settlements to be reached after the war are of incalculable importance to the future happiness of mankind. It is entirely likely that the question as to whether there will be another and even more disastrous Third World War will be determined right there. It is not strange, therefore, that the Delaware Conference assigned the question of the political bases of a just and durable peace to one of its ablest commissions. This commission took the preliminary report which had been worked out by one of the four regional study groups, debated its points, revised it to conform with their own views, and presented it to the conference. The conference as a whole then further discussed these conclusions and finally issued its own document.

This part of the Delaware Conference report, while short, is packed with insight. In this chapter we will analyze it point by point. Since the conclusions which will one day be reached by governments on these matters will vitally affect the life of every living person, the leadership which the men and women who were at Delaware offer should afford the basis of a discussion at once interesting and important.

I—Is This the Business of the Church?

THE DELAWARE CONFERENCE, composed of representatives of all the major churches of American Protestant Christianity, was certain that the churches not only

had the privilege but faced the duty of speaking their minds on this question of the political bases of a just and durable peace. They began their report on this subject thus:

> The churches of America face clear responsibilities in seeking to establish a better world when the war has ended. First among post-war duties will be the achievement of a just peace settlement with due regard to the welfare of all nations, the vanquished, the overrun and the victors alike.

In taking this position with regard to the peace settlement, the Delaware delegates had the backing of the Malvern Conference of British church leaders. Meeting a year before, these men said that not only on this issue but with reference to public life generally Christians owed it to their fellows to assume what responsibility they could. "It is of great importance," said Malvern, "that Christian people should take the fullest possible share in public life, both in parliament, in municipal councils, in trade unions and in all other bodies affecting the public welfare, and constantly [use] such ways of expressing Christian principles through those channels."

While the Delaware Conference was meeting a general of the United States army was issuing an order which meant exile from their homes for 100,000 people on the west coast of the United States. The sole ground for the order was that these 100,000, of whom 60,000 were American citizens by reason of being born here, were of Japanese ancestry. So the conference was meeting a contemporary issue when it declared:

> We appeal to our fellow citizens to recognize now the crucial importance of justice in race relations in our own country as paving the way for the wider recognition of it which will be essential to world peace. Our attitudes toward other racial groups have all too frequently prevented the operation of justice in the past. We remind our fellow Christians of the appeal of the Japanese for recognition of racial equality at the time of the Versailles Peace Conference. The refusal of that plea is recognized as a factor contributing to the breakdown of peace. We would now commit ourselves to the task of protecting the rights of American-born citizens of Oriental parentage, who are likely to suffer evil consequences unnecessarily because of racial prejudices and discrimination of our attitudes toward Asiatics.

Since the conference adjourned, an appeal has gone out for the churches in the interior of the United States to help

these dispossessed people on the Pacific coast, especially by giving shelter to one or more out of the thousands of Christian families affected. Those who can should write to the Committee on National Security and Fair Play, Dr. F. Herron Smith, 2816 Hillegass Avenue, Berkeley, California.

There are some things which the common body can do for all the churches. Such an action is contained in the Delaware proposal that a joint policy be worked out on this issue.

> We endorse the proposal that the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America set up a commission for the study of racial and cultural problems in American life as a necessary measure to support our effort for a just and durable peace among the nations. It is imperative that we put our own house in order so that we can contribute effectively to a sound organization of international life. To that end we need continuous study, interpretation and a device to guard our churches in facing the opportunities and duties of racial and cultural adjustment in the present crisis, both at home and abroad.

All of this has powerful international repercussions. Just as every lynching perpetrated in the United States is blazoned across the headlines in India and in Japan and other far places, so our other actions on this issue are watched with sharp attention. It is important if the excesses of the nazis are to be counteracted and the propaganda of the Japanese to be answered—and especially if we are to be able to face the clear democracy of the Christian gospel of equality and liberty under Christ—that our government speak an unequivocal word showing our purpose to make effective our purposes in this regard. And the sooner, the better! So Delaware said:

> Also, when further statements of peace aims are made, we ask our government to clarify in more detail their peace aims toward recognizing social equality, opportunity and aid for migration, and protection of religious, political, racial and cultural minorities.

II—Isolation Again?

WHAT shall the role of the United States be in the post-war world? At the end of the First World War our country retired into its own world, refusing to become a member of the League of Nations or to accept responsibility for the settlement which was worked out at Versailles. Now we are a belligerent in the Second World War. When that is

over, what shall we do? We shall be confronted with vast problems at home, made more serious by their neglect during the years of war. "The unfinished business of American democracy" will clamor for attention. There will be those who will insist that it be taken care of before we consider the wider responsibilities of world citizenship. The desire to withdraw within our own national shell will once again be strong—perhaps strong enough to serve as the basis for a powerful political movement. "Which way America?" is still one of the world's most important unsettled questions.

The Delaware Conference faced the considerations which point toward isolationism, but unequivocally rejected them. America, it said, is from now on out a part of the world and must accept its share of responsibility for peace as well as for war in world affairs. To quote the words of the Findings:

> In order that such a settlement may tend toward a better political order, we, as citizens of the United States of America, advocate the following principles and measures: 1. That the United States pursue a responsible national policy with concern for the welfare of all peoples and that the United States cooperate fully with all nations and peoples in working towards a world order of justice and peace.

What does it mean to ask the United States to "pursue a responsible national policy with concern for the welfare of all peoples"? Can we do that and hold on to the idea of unlimited national sovereignty, in which the nation is responsible to nobody for its actions? Can we "pursue a responsible national policy" and frame our tariff policy without regard to the views or welfare of other nations?

National sovereignty is a very precious thing, especially to citizens of a very large and powerful nation like ours. But it is also a very dangerous thing. We rely on it for protection, but it has not succeeded in saving us from involvement in two calamitous wars in the last generation. "The absolute sovereignty of the state, operating on two different planes—the national and the international—has wrought more havoc in the recent life of man than any other single principle." These words from the *Economist* of London, perhaps the leading economic journal in the world, show how dangerous the retention of complete national sovereignty is. **Is there a way in which it can be surrendered with safety?**

National sovereignty can be maintained—by the strongest nation—while we let the rest of the world "stew in its own juice." But if we abandon complete national sovereignty, we must become concerned with the rest of the world. By pain-

ful experiences like this war we discover that our lives are all bound up with those of the rest of the world. Whether we like it or not, and whether we know how to discharge our obligations in it or not, we are a part of the world community and must either suffer or prosper as such. That requires that we must return in our international relations to the principle of "bear ye one another's burdens and so fulfill the law of Christ." How can we do that in this situation?

III—When the War Ends

THE DELAWARE CONFERENCE followed its renunciation of isolationism by urging:

> That during a transitional period after the fighting has ended, the efforts of the peoples of the world be devoted, in proportion to their ability, to the re-establishment of order, the provision of food, shelter and medical service, and the restoration of stable government and economic activity, especially in the devastated territories. These emergency measures must include policing by joint action for the protection of minorities and disarmed populations, and positive measures of economic and cultural cooperation. They should be carried out under international authorities, representative of all peoples concerned. There should be no punitive reparations, no humiliating decrees of war guilt, and no arbitrary dismemberment of nations. All of these emergency measures should tend toward a growing structure of international order.

Dr. William Paton, British secretary of the World Council of Churches and of the International Missionary Council, was a speaker at Delaware. He said that while he expected the United Nations to win the war, he still viewed the future with profound pessimism. The toll of the war in hate, death and destruction, he warned, would take a long time to overcome. He had in mind the present and growing starvation of millions in Greece, France, Belgium, Holland, Norway, Poland and China; the spread of hunger and war-bred disease to other lands; the vast destruction of homes and other property; the complete disorganization of life on several continents; the poverty arising out of the war added to that which already exists; and, as a result of these and other malign forces, the destruction of trust between nations and peoples and the rise of the spirit of revenge which may breed more war and suffering for generations to come.

Responsible action by the United States in this situation, Delaware said, would require us to do our share in restoring order. That will undoubtedly require the aid of American armed forces in policing areas where government has broken down. **Does that mean that America must scatter soldiers all over the world for decades to come? What should be the purpose of this policing? In what ways do police methods differ from military methods? In what way does the authority which is back of them differ?**

Second, Delaware recommended that our country aid devastated peoples through the provision of food, shelter and medical care. That will have to be done immediately and on a huge scale. **Is this the answer to the need of our farmers for a foreign market?** Some of the nations now starving have large sums of money impounded by our government in this country. Until this is gone they can pay for what they get. What should we do when their money is gone? After the last war we loaned Germany, Britain and other nations large sums of money for rehabilitation and reconstruction. Most of it was never repaid. **Do you expect that the war debts will be repaid this time? Are we justified in providing food and materials for reconstruction with no expectation of repayment?** A. A. Berle, assistant secretary of state, declared in his book, *New Directions in a New World,* that we shall be compelled to do this, that it will be possible and that it will be good for us! **But will the people of the United States again provide vast sums which will go into rebuilding European cities—as they did in the early 1920's—and let their own slums stand?**

All of this, according to Delaware, should be carried out under international authority. Since it would have to begin immediately at the end of the war—some of it might begin before—it would have to be done by the United Nations acting through their authorities on the ground. It is important to note that the nations concerned should use their own people. Do we now have an organization which could take care of the enormous problems of feeding millions of people? The Commission which fed the Belgians in the First World War could be easily expanded to meet post-war needs. Would it not be a good thing to start work now, even in a small way, to train personnel for the larger task to come? When a world government is set up, presumably it would be the international authority that would then have to take charge. But even that will have to discover trained men adequate to handle problems of such magnitude. **Where are such men going to come from? What start have the churches made in this direction? The Quakers? The missionary**

movement? The conscientious objectors? What more could we do?

IV—There Must Be No Revenge!

AT THE END of the First World War, Germany was compelled to acknowledge her *sole* guilt for starting the war. She was then required to pay reparations for all the damage done during the war. With the European area of Germany reduced by one-eighth and her population by 6,500,000, she was deprived of all her "colonies and virtually all investments and holdings abroad. In 1913 these foreign holdings had totaled more than $6,000,000,000 and had been equal to nearly 10 per cent of the country's wealth. She lost 15.5 per cent of her arable land, 12 per cent of her livestock, and almost 10 per cent of her manufacturing establishments. Her navy, formerly second only to Great Britain's, was virtually wiped out and her army was reduced to one-seventh the size of that of France. By her European cessions Germany lost potash, iron, coal, zinc, and more than half her lead. The surrender of her colonies entailed the loss of large rubber, oil and fiber supplies. . . . Finally, Germany signed a blank reparation check." (Langsam, p. 123.) That check required her to turn over some $6,000,000,000 in gold or its equivalent by 1921. In May 1921 the Reparation Commission met and fixed the additional sum which must be paid by Germany at $32,000,000,000. Other defeated nations were also required to agree to pay reparations, most of which were never paid and never will be.

Remembering the fate of the reparations which were assessed at the end of the First World War, the Delaware churchmen declared that this time *"there should be no punitive reparations, no humiliating decrees of war guilt and no arbitrary dismemberment of nations."*

Is this a sound policy? Should Japan be compelled to restore the territory she has taken from China? Should she be compelled to repay China for the damage that has been done in the occupied territory? Are the two obligations in different categories? Should she be compelled to evacuate Indo-China, Malaysia, the Philippines, the Netherlands East Indies and Burma? In that event, should she turn these former colonies back to their former masters, should she turn them over to their own people, or should she turn some of them over to their own people and some to an international body which would administer them as a mandate until they were prepared

for self-government? Should Japan be stripped of her merchant fleet, her factories?

The questions that have been raised about Japan must also be raised concerning Germany and Italy. Punitive reparations did not work last time to prevent another war. Have we enough of the grace of God in our hearts this time to exercise the virtue of forgiveness and thus to avert another war? Is this possible unless we admit that we too have been guilty—that we are responsible for the long-term policies which helped to bring on this war?

V—Eventually—World Government

THE WAR, coming on top of a growing number of common problems of international life, requires that some sort of machinery be set up through which our nation and other countries can confront their mutual responsibilities. The Delaware Conference listed the major areas of this common responsibility as follows:

> That among the functions of government that must be performed are the preservation of public order, the maintenance of economic opportunity, the safeguarding of public health and welfare, and the direction of population movements. In large part, these functions must be performed by local and national governments, but in part they can now be effectively carried out only by international authority.

This international authority might be administered by a group of nations who had been allies in victorious war. That is not a very just form of international government. It might be exercised through a regional group of nations, working through a body like the Pan-American Union, providing it were given the power. Or it might be a world body like the League of Nations, but including all countries.

The fact that many of the functions of government can now be carried out effectively only on an international scale means that a great many governments, including our own, are going to have to revise their ideas of sovereignty. The term "sovereignty" always points to the place where final authority is believed to lie. Our own nation has never acknowledged that sovereignty could be found in anything above its own will or desires.

Is it right for our nation to inject its mighty power into world affairs during a war, only to withdraw and leave the other nations to bear the burden of carrying

on the world order which has been created by the war?

The past twenty-five years have taught us what mistakes can be made in international life. The present war shows what a frightful penalty is attached to mistakes of this kind. The churchmen who met at Delaware voiced the determination of millions of their countrymen not to make the same mistakes twice when they recommended:

> That certain powers now exercised by national governments must, therefore, be delegated to international government, organized and acting in accordance with a world system of law. Among the powers so delegated must be the power of final judgment in controversies between nations, the maintenance and use of armed forces except for preservation of domestic order, and the regulation of international trade and population movements among nations.

Should the United States be prepared, once such a government, regional or world-wide in scope, were established, to submit to it cases of international disagreements? Should the question of payments for the lease-lend goods—on which the United States and Great Britain have negotiated for months without being able to reach an agreement—be submitted to a World Court when one becomes available? The obligation is currently estimated by Senator LaFollette at $18,400,000,000.

VI—Shall We Disarm Everybody?

THE DELAWARE delegates declared that "the maintenance and use of armed forces except for the preservation of domestic order" should be reserved to international government. Not long ago Secretary of the Navy Knox declared that this country would never again do what it did after the Washington Conference in 1922—deliberately sink a considerable proportion of its navy by agreement with other nations, who did the same. If we accept the counsel of the Delaware Conference, however, we shall go even further. We shall turn over *all* our ships of war except those that are necessary for the pursuit of smugglers to an international authority. This will probably sink most of them. Other nations must do the same. Thenceforth it will be illegal to build a warship. Our army—now over 3,000,000 men and growing daily—would be sent home. Our war industries—supporting over 20,000,000 people—would be disbanded.

What would this mean? Before we decide whether it

would be desirable, we must determine whether such action is possible, assuming the international situation justified it. Obviously, without preparation for absorption of these millions in peacetime industry, it would be suicidal. The economic crisis would produce revolution and our last state would be worse than the first. *Preparations for peace require a time as extended, a dislocation as vast, a plan as clear, as preparations for war.* But peace is possible, even though it requires a higher order of statesmanship than any nation now seems to have.

Disarmament is desirable because (1) armament races are an important cause of war; (2) the cost of armaments is too great for any nation to bear and at the same time provide a decent standard of living for its people; (3) the possession of armaments is a powerful stimulant to nationalism, while its absence tends to encourage a peaceful and international solution; (4) no international government has any reality unless it has a monopoly on available armament; (5) disarmament robs munitions makers of their influence on national governments and on public policy; (6) it changes industry from working metals into guns and explosives to making things for the people's use, thus demonstrating to them the advantages of peace and making them more reluctant than ever to fight.

Delaware advocated that the "regulation of international trade and population movements among nations" be done through international authority. That would mean that tariffs would be internationally administered. **Would American farmers and manufacturers permit our leaders to agree to this kind of arrangement? If we say it is impossible, then what is the alternative?** We have just passed through a period in international life when the alternative was in force. It brought war, not peace.

And are we willing to submit our immigration policies to international scrutiny and control? What about our Oriental Exclusion policy? Before giving the answer, let us remember that such an international authority would desire to keep the peace. It would therefore not allow migrations which would jeopardize good relations. It would work to bring all such movements within the scope of international agreements. Peace on these terms would be costly. Would it be more costly than war?

Simply to enumerate what these words mean in blunt reality shows how far the average citizen and the average congressman in this country have to go before they can be realized. It also shows how courageous the churchmen who met at Delaware were. **Is the average church member yet ready to go as far as this in order to get a just and**

durable peace? Are you? Why not put all immigration on a quota basis?

Nevertheless the churchmen did not stop with sweeping generalizations. They showed a clear understanding of the nature of the international organization which would be necessary if these ideas were to be realized.

> That international authorities competent to perform these functions may be of two sorts. (1) The ultimate requirement is a duly constituted world government of delegated powers: an international legislative body, an international court with adequate jurisdiction, international administrative bodies with necessary powers, and adequate international police forces and provision for world-wide economic sanctions. (2) As steps toward, and potential organs of, such world government, there is need for many sorts of international bodies charged with specific duties, such as the International Labor Organization, and various agencies such as those now acting for the United Nations to coordinate natural resources, shipping and food distribution. Such bodies must be adapted to the service of world order and government, and must not become a substitute therefor. In the operation of these agencies, and in progressing toward full world government, every effort should be made to achieve agreement and voluntary cooperation of all concerned.

VII—Outline of World Government

IN THE FIRST of these highly important sections of its report on the political bases of a just and durable peace, the Delaware Conference outlines the major channels through which a world government must function. They are, as we have seen, the channels through which all government must work. None of the three is effective without the remaining two. They are, furthermore, compatible with democracy. We have had them as essentials of our political structure since the founding of the United States. We have no right to claim that we are in favor of international law or a world government without being prepared to accept all three.

In the second section, Delaware pointed out that the germ of this world organization already exists in the temporary international bodies which are channeling the war effort of the United Nations. When peace comes, it appears to suggest that the first step toward international institutions would be the enlargement of these bodies. How would they be

enlarged? How else but by including in them the representatives of the neutral states—there are still quite a number—and the defeated powers. **Is public opinion ready for that? Is the church?**

While such a world government must be accepted as the goal, Delaware was far too realistic to believe that it could be achieved in a bound. The conference spoke of this "world government" only as an "ultimate requirement." There will have to be steps of transition. But these steps must always be recognized as only a means toward the greater end. And the steps must not be too short! They cannot be too long delayed. When the conference said that, it was on solid historical ground. Remember the League of Nations! During its formative years, it was a partial league. The United States remained out by choice. But Russia and Germany were shut out by the victorious powers.

The League failed because two ideas which were assumed in its organization were never achieved. The first was that the League was to be universal. The second was that it was to consist of *disarmed* nations. However much we may be blamed for the first failure, the dominant powers of the League were fully responsible for the second.

None of the things planned at Delaware are possible without universal disarmament. In an armed world, the international police force would simply reproduce the present situation. Huge forces representing international government would again soon be clashing with other vast armies representing the nations challenging that government. That would be ruinous. Even the fringe of nations not now involved in war would be engaged, and we should have another World War which would actually blaze over the whole world. Disarmament by agreement, with no nation maintaining more than a token force on land, sea or air, is the only condition on which an international government could function or an international police force be effective.

VIII—A Beginning Has Been Made

COURAGE to face the enormous task of setting up international government may be gained from reflecting upon the fact that many of the functions of international government were already carried on in a partial manner before the outbreak of the war. Much valuable experience was thus acquired, and a beginning was made toward training an international civil service to administer world government. For a number of years the Assembly of the League of Nations

served as the meeting place where the foreign ministers of the leading governments of the world could come together to consider their mutual problems in an atmosphere of friendly negotiation. While war eventually marked the failure of the League, it should not be forgotten that war would probably have come much sooner had the League not functioned.

The League provided an international health service, which set up guards to keep epidemics and plagues within the districts where they first appeared; an international labor office, which uncovered the facts about wages, hours and working conditions in all countries, and hastened their improvement in the most backward; it called disarmament conferences, settled some disputes, administered some dependencies as mandates, started to codify international law, investigated the Japanese assault on Manchuria, attempted to restrain Italy from grabbing Ethiopia, helped to curb the international traffic in women and children and to stop the trade in opium.

In addition, in the years preceding the Second World War, international controls were worked out by agreement for the production and distribution of many commodities. Rubber, oil, tin, wheat, sugar, cotton, textiles and other commodities were produced and distributed on a quota basis, which was arrived at by what amounted to international economic treaties. This need to develop just controls of international trade is undoubtedly one of the most important problems with which the peace conference will have to deal. And a beginning has already been made!

XI—What About Colonies?

THE DELAWARE church leaders believed that the colonial system has had a great deal to do with the recurrence of war. They voted:

> That, utilizing experience with the mandate principle, a system of administration of colonial territories under international authority be developed. In areas now under colonial administration, advance toward self-government should be carried forward in substantial progress. The affairs of peoples deemed not yet capable of self-government should be administered as a common trust, by international authority, in the interest of these peoples as members of a world society.

It is of interest to note that the Malvern Conference of British churchmen did not have a word to say on a question

which might have appeared to be closer to British life than to our own.

In Geneva, Switzerland, the World Council of Churches called together in 1939 a commission of "lay experts" of the churches to work on the peace problem, although by that time it was clearly impossible to avert the coming war. Among the subjects of their consideration was colonies. They declared that their purpose was not to set forth a plan, but to lay down principles on which statesmen could hope to find their plan. They recommended:

"1. That indigenous peoples must not be treated as pawns of international policy;

2. That the paramount aim of the governments concerned must be the moral, social and material welfare of the native population as well as native autonomy as comprehensive as the conditions of each territory allow, to the end that ultimately the population of the area may be able to assume responsibility for its own destiny;

3. That the native institutions, and in particular the systems of land tenure, be used and developed;

4. That the denial of essential rights upon the basis of race discrimination be recognized as inconsistent with the welfare of the governed peoples;

5. That the militarization of native peoples be forbidden;

6. That political propaganda in colonial territories for foreign purposes be recognized as injurious to native society;

7. That the principle of economic equality be recognized, subject always to the paramount claims of native economic welfare;

8. That such a system be carried out under the effective supervision of an international body whose members shall be independent of national control. These are the minimum requirements of a disinterested government of native peoples, guaranteeing freedom and looking toward autonomy."

At the end of the First World War, Germany's colonies were taken from her by the Treaty of Versailles. They represented 1,100,000 square miles of land, 13,000,000 people and an investment of $125,000,000. These colonies were not appropriated outright by the victors. Instead, the League of Nations declared (Article 22 of the Covenant) that "the well-being and development of such peoples form a sacred trust of civilization and that securities for the performance of this trust should be embodied in this covenant." The League, having assumed authority over these colonies, then transferred this authority to its member states as a "mandate" from the League.

Who got the mandated colonies? That is where the mandate principle began to break down. Great Britain and her

dominions got by far the largest part, France and Japan each got important assignments. The United States refused to accept any mandates. Italy was willing, but got nothing, which goes a long way to explain why she is fighting on the side of Germany today.

While the mandate system was corrupted by the imperialism of the mandatory powers, the principle was sound. It focused attention on the "sacred trust" involved in colonial rule. Many believe that it still offers the only way in which nations which are not yet ready for self-government can be ruled until they are able to stand on their own feet. An Englishman, Leonard Barnes, in his book, *The Future of Colonies,* advocated the extension of the principle to *all* colonies, whether they become the spoils of war or not. At the end of this war the question is sure to arise in new force. Will the problem of dependencies be settled by victors grabbing for colonies for themselves? If that is done, future wars are certain. The only alternative is some kind of mandate system.

Note what lands have already been overrun. Shall they all become the spoils of war? As this is written they include the Netherlands East Indies, French Indo-China, Siam, Malaysia, Burma, eastern China, the Philippines, many Pacific islands, Libya, the Belgian Empire in Africa, Ethiopia, Eritrea, Somaliland, Syria, Iran, Iraq, parts of the Portuguese Pacific islands, parts of the French African Empire and some French colonies in America.

President Roosevelt on February 23, 1942, said: "The Atlantic Charter applies not only to parts of the world that border the Atlantic but to the whole world; disarmament of aggressors, self-determination of nations and peoples and the four freedoms—freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom from want and freedom from fear." The offer of a qualified dominion status to India, as announced in the newspapers of March 30, 1942, indicated that, for whatever reasons, Mr. Churchill had also now changed his opinion concerning the application of the promises of the Atlantic Charter. The United Nations appear to be moving toward a new colonial policy.

Much depends upon the attitude of the United States. If we forget our experience with the Philippines and again seek empire, no durable peace can come at the end of this war. There are signs that powerful groups are working in that direction. One of our most influential publishers talks of this as "the American century" in terms which indicate that he believes empire is in the offing, that we are destined to shoulder the "white man's burden" when the old colonial powers lay it down.

What qualifications have we for governing others? Of course we have renounced territorial aspirations, but what if we should find at the end of the war that certain rich territories have no government, that they will fall into the hands of other nations if we do not take them—temporarily, of course—and that we need products they grow, such as rubber? Would a mandate system be possible without a world government?

Finally, the Delaware Conference laid an obligation on all churches to express their beliefs to congressmen. It voted:

> That the influence of the churches shall be employed to keep the foregoing principles before the attention of diplomats and statesmen.

Chapter Five

The Economic Bases of a Just and Durable Peace

Part I

"THE SYSTEM under which we have lived is a predisposing cause of war even though those who direct and profit by it have desired peace." This was the judgment of the Malvern Conference of British churches. It finds much to support it in the facts of recent history. The American churchmen who met at Delaware held that the economic causes of war are a legitimate cause of Christian study and action. They said:

> Our concern with world economics is an obvious consequence of our desire, as Christians, to realize an ever richer spiritual world fellowship. While the strengthening of the spiritual bond may help to prepare for a solution of the economic problems of the world, the spiritual union may itself be gravely impaired or disrupted by conflict arising in the economic realm. We are deeply disturbed by the economic distress of millions of our fellow men and by economic conditions that threaten the extension of the Kingdom of God on earth.

The fiercest fighting of the present war rages around the places from which men secure oil, rubber, rice, wheat and

metals. Battles are being fought over the control of key points on the routes which give access to these everyday necessities. **What does this indicate concerning the causes and the purposes of this war? Do we need a formal declaration of war aims to see that the economic factor is a driving force behind giant armies? Is it the only force? The principal force?**

I—How This War Is Different

CHRISTIAN statesmanship has no problem more important than that of Christianizing the use of machines and their products. Modern war is different from all previous wars because machines have put killing on a mass production basis. Industrialized slaughter of men and destruction of property has become so efficient that there is a serious question whether civilization itself can survive if the way to a just and durable peace is not found soon. It cannot be found without giving attention to its economic causes.

The Delaware Conference did not adopt a "holier-than-thou" attitude toward the causes of this war. It held that the war has issued out of a general world disorder—an earth-wide sickness of society. It said:

> We view the economic tensions and distresses of our day as symptoms of a general world disorder. In our era production has been carried on primarily with a view to monetary gains. Profit has been the principal incentive relied upon to turn the wheels of industry and to bring forth the fruits of the soil.

Does the *motive* which governs us in our use of machines still make a difference? Or have machines reduced man to the status of a robot whose purposes do not matter?

II—What Have Profits to Do with War?

CONSIDER your automobile tires. Columbus found West Indian natives playing with balls of the strange stuff which we know as rubber. When bicycles and automobiles were invented, Brazilian rubber cushioned their wheels. Until 1915 half the world's rubber came from that country. But it was discovered that labor was cheaper in Malaysia, where rubber would also grow. So vast plantations were set there,

where profits were greater. At the outbreak of the present war, over 92 per cent of all rubber came from colonies.

Malaysia, now overrun, is a colony of Great Britain, and a bone of contention in this war. Its people are passive. This is not their war. Would free Brazil have been equally indifferent? If the rubber industry had grown up there and its profits had been turned back into the development of that great country, would war have been more or less likely?

Meeting a year before Delaware, the Malvern Conference of British churchmen was even more explicit. A resolution, introduced by Sir Richard Ackland and passed by "a very large majority," attributed war not only to the profit motive, but to ownership—the very basis of capitalism. Acknowledging that "all systems can be perverted by the selfishness of men," it nevertheless insisted that *"the church should declare that the maintenance of that part of the structure of our society by which the ownership of the great resources of our community can be vested in the hands of private individuals is a stumbling block . . . making it harder for the generality of men to live Christian lives.* As long as these resources can be owned, men will strive for their ownership. Those who are most successful in the struggle will have sought this ownership for themselves and will be regarded as the leaders of our economic life. They will thereby set the tone for our whole society. As a consequence, it will be found impossible to abandon a way of life founded on the supremacy of the economic motive, or to advance nearer to a form of society founded upon a belief in the authority of God's plan for mankind. The time has come for Christians to proclaim the need for seeking some form of society in which this stumbling block will be removed. Those of us who support this resolution pledge ourselves to do so."[1]

III—Defects in the System

THE ECONOMIC ORDER which has grown up around the use of machinery is different in important respects from that which prevailed formerly. Since it has developed in response to needs which were themselves continually changing, it is in constant flux and change. The churchmen who met at Delaware looked at it with an objective eye. They were primarily interested in human welfare. Consequently

[1]This is the original wording of the Ackland resolution. A later and "official" version had been slightly toned down in places. For example, it said that ownership "may be," instead of flatly declaring that it "is," a stumbling block.

they judged the system from the point of view of men's highest good. This was their reasoned judgment:

> This system has in recent years developed grave defects. There have occurred mass unemployment, widespread dispossession from homes and farms, destitution, lack of opportunity for youth and of security for old age. These calamities, which have often been accentuated by short range self-seeking trade policies of various nations, have made for war. There has been a sharp increase in economic nationalism with tariffs being raised, monetary systems adjusted for the benefit of national interests, and a race for colonies on the part of some countries. Out of this economic insecurity has come an atmosphere favorable to the rise of demagogues and dictators. Mass unrest has afforded violent and unscrupulous men the opportunity to seize leadership and has made any rational approach to international disputes impossible.

On March 17, 1942, the London *Times* carried an article by Sir William Beveridge, Oxford professor and leading British economist. Affirming his belief that "bribery by price or wage is often an ineffective spur to output," this former director of the London School of Economics said that "the time calls for two changes—first, for the state to take direct responsibility for the control of vital industries and for the distribution of income and, second, for the assertion of the principle that service rather than personal gain should be the mainspring of the war effort in industry as in fighting . . . To treat private gain as a dominant motive in the war effort is to slander our people . . . In war, the most effective spur to heroic efforts is an idea, not hope of personal gain."

Was Sir William right? If "the most effective spur to heroic efforts is an idea, not hope of personal gain," what has Christianity to contribute to that idea? What have the Christian ideas of the brotherhood of man, the duty of bearing one another's burdens, of the relation of sin and salvation, repentance and reconciliation, to do with this problem?

IV—Is Compulsion the Answer?

ACCORDING to Harvard Professor Sorokin, only three kinds of relations are possible between people. They are the compulsory, the contractual and the family relationship. Compulsion requires that the compeller take no responsibility for those he compels to do his will. The contract re-

quires only a limited degree of responsibility—just what "is nominated in the bond." But each member of the family assumes an unlimited degree of responsibility for the other members. Christianity has from the beginning insisted that all humanity is one family, with God as the Father of all men.

Delaware recognized that compulsion has become the basis of all economic life in some countries. It pointed out that:

> In this chaotic situation there has arisen in certain countries an alternative way of production which is based on complete management and control of all economic life by government. With this has come a system of compulsion which deprives the individual of freedoms, economic, intellectual and spiritual, necessary to human dignity.

Is it possible for an economic system to find its "most effective spur" in the unlimited extension of the Christian idea of the family? Is the lease-lend policy of the American government a partial expression of that idea? Can the churches aid in giving economic embodiment to the Christian doctrine of "giving to all freely and withholding not"? Is the profit system based on the family idea, the contract idea or the compulsory idea?

It is frequently said that the modern world must choose between the profit system and a system of state-controlled industry. The Delaware Conference declared that it did not feel compelled to take either of these. It voted:

> We do not believe that we are limited to a choice between these two alternatives. If this seems the only choice it is largely because the churches have failed generally to inculcate Christian motivation. Willingness to strive and to produce and to render service should not be dependent either wholly upon profit motivation or wholly upon compulsion. We urge upon the churches that they have the great opportunity and responsibility to make possible a generally acceptable solution by bringing people to a different and more Christian motivation.

V—What Is the Church's Responsibility?

THE DUTY of the church, according to Delaware, lies in the moral realm. It concerns human values. But it does not stop there. Man is a child of God. He is touched with eternity. The church must insist, even in a day of radical and revolutionary change, that that be not forgotten.

In a day when revolutionary upheavals have swept away the traditional economic organization in Russia, Italy and Germany, and now when, by reason of the necessities of war, that economic order is being radically reorganized everywhere, the church has a manifest duty in the economic field, both urban and rural. That duty is not to line up on the side of any economic system and certainly not to prescribe details or advocate panaceas. Its responsibility lies in a deeper moral realm. As Christians we must be vitally concerned for the preservation of human values in any and every system. The Christian doctrine of man as a child of God carries with it the demand that all men, without distinction of race, creed or class, shall be afforded the economic means of life and growth.

Economic systems are made for man, not man for economic systems. Without speculating on the basis of theory but basing its conclusions on the Christian doctrine of the sacredness of human personality, the Delaware Conference defined the economic rights of man as a child of God. It also condemned as "manifestly wrong" the current practices which sin against human welfare. One of its most eloquent and moving statements was this:

Any economic program which allows the quest for private gain to disregard human welfare, which regiments human beings and denies them freedom of collective bargaining, thus reducing labor to a mere commodity; any program which results in mass unemployment or dire poverty in mine or factory or farm; any program which fails to conserve natural resources and results in soil deterioration and erosion and along with it human erosion and deterioration of rural life in home and school and church, is manifestly wrong. Against such evils the church should arouse the conscience of mankind in every nation. The church must demand economic arrangements measured by human welfare as revealed by secure employment, decent homes and living conditions, opportunity for youth, freedom of occupation and of cultural activities, recognition of the rights of labor, and security in illness and old age. To secure these arrangements it must appeal to the Christian motive of human service as paramount to personal gain or governmental coercion.

Does the church have a right to be heard as an expert in human welfare? What example have you known where "the Christian motive of human service" has been successfuly invoked? Is the teaching profession an example

of an area of life where neither the profit motive nor the compulsory motive is predominant? Can you think of other large areas of life where this is now the case? Can their number be extended?

VI—No Panacea—but Experiment!

CHANGE is inherent in economic life. Today it is speeding up. But change toward what? Through bitter experience we know that progress is not automatic. The Delaware Conference urged that voluntary cooperation be the basis of inevitable change. We must experiment, it declared, with "various forms of ownership and control, private, cooperative and public."

> The building of a just and peaceful world involves the building of national and local communities on the basis of justice, freedom and cooperation for the common good.
>
> We believe that a new ordering of economic life is both imminent and imperative, and that it will come either through voluntary cooperation within the framework of democracy or through explosive political revolution. We recognize the need of experimentation with various forms of ownership and control, private, cooperative and public. It is hardly to be supposed that any one system, whether of private, cooperative or public enterprise, is suited to all kinds of production, distribution and service. The production and distribution of goods on the basis of voluntary cooperation is an experiment which in many parts of the world is meeting with notable success.

Do you have a cooperative store in your town? A private business run on a profit-sharing or mutual basis? Which kinds of ownership and control are represented in the following: A community forest, a cooperative farm, a milk producers' cooperative, a joint stock company, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Miami (Ohio) conservancy project?

Self-sufficiency is now the goal of many nations. War provides powerful drives in that direction. But Delaware did not look on this as a permanent condition. Instead, it expected interdependence to grow. It considered it the duty of Christians to encourage that growth.

> We believe that no nation or group of nations can solve in a permanent way the economic problems interior to

itself without the cooperation in good will of the other peoples of the world. The economic prosperity of one nation bears a direct and not an inverse ratio to that of others. It is necessary to abandon injurious forms of economic competition and to avoid entrance upon the disastrous chain of economic counter-measures and reprisals which often mark the policy of competing nations. We endorse the principle that "national interdependence now replaces independence and that action by any nation, notably in the economic field, which materially and adversely affects other people, is not purely a matter of domestic policy but is coupled with an international responsibility."

What should the churches do about the proposal of the Federal Council that Congress refuse to consider any economic measure that might affect the life of another nation until it had collected and published the facts as to how that action would affect others?

Chapter Six

The Economic Bases of a Just and Durable Peace

Part II

THE DELAWARE CONFERENCE approved, along with such general principles as have already been noted in this discussion, a group of economic recommendations and convictions. These represent the views of the churchmen there assembled as to how the economic causes of war can be removed and the working conditions and relationships of modern society Christianized.

The Delaware delegates first resolved:

> That every man should have the opportunity to share in the ownership of both personal and productive property, such as a home, a farm and economic enterprises.

One criticism that is often leveled against advocates of socialization is that they want to put everything under the control of the government or some other collective. The Delaware Conference not only did not seek to restrict private ownership, but it desired to extend it. It is to be noted that

the first two items mentioned were accessories to personal living, under the immediate control of the citizen and serving his personal needs. Even in nations where collectivism is far advanced, such as the Scandinavian countries, ownership of such things is encouraged. That is not true, however, in Russia, where all land and housing is nationalized. Aside from Russia, one of the countries where only a relatively small proportion of the people own their homes and their land is the "rich" United States. More than half the farmers in this country are tenants, while in the cities only 37.5 per cent of the people own their homes.

To extend the proportion of those who own their homes and farms will be, in the judgment of the Delaware Conference, to increase the number of people who have a personal stake in democracy. It will make for more stability among people, cutting down the restlessness which has become almost epidemic and strengthening community life. It will also strengthen the churches. A much smaller percentage of tenants are church members than are owners of homes and farms. **Do you agree with these conclusions?**

The final clause in the Delaware resolution is puzzling. Every man should have the opportunity, it said, of ownership of "economic enterprises." What kind of economic enterprises? Surely some—such as the liquor and the munitions businesses—are harmful to humanity, and the right of ownership of such enterprises is one which, from a Christian point of view, such a conference would be unlikely to approve. The aim of the economic enterprise must surely be taken into account.

Further, the social relationship of the enterprise must also figure among the considerations which enter into its approval for Christians. For example, many economic enterprises are such that by their nature they can better be conducted as public rather than private businesses. An example is the post office. Many people believe that the telephone and telegraph should also be publicly owned and controlled in this country as they are in nearly every other.

I—Unemployment And War

THE NEXT major economic problem which the Delaware Conference tackled was that of the right to work. On this it said:

> That every member and family of the human race has a right to steady employment and to earn an income such

as may provide the necessities of life and growth and is in accord with the wealth-producing capacity of his day and the requirements of responsible conservation of natural resources.

This resolution struck squarely at unemployment, which has been—next to war—just about the biggest problem in industrialized countries for the last generation. As late as 1939 there were more than 10,000,000 unemployed men of working age in the United States. Ten million men unemployed for a year makes 10,000,000 work-years lost. With an average of 10,000,000 unemployed from 1930 to 1940, the United States lost at least 100,000,000 work-years.

When we look around us, we see what that means. What could not a labor force of ten million men working for ten years do! They could transform the face of America! Erosion could be stopped, a vast highway system could be built, cities could be rebuilt to allow for sanitation and health, ships could make ocean transportation as cheap as staying at home, food could be raised so that every child would have enough to eat, so that half our young men would not prove unacceptable to draft boards for health reasons and our young women would prove to be competent to mother the next generation.

Instead of this, see what has happened. Millions of unemployed spent years steeped in despair and some of them finally became unemployable. Demagogues found a ready ear among the restless and the jobless, and politics has been corrupted. Youth graduated from schools into long periods of joblessness. Homes were broken up. And even when finally Congress voted conscription, so that millions who could find little place in the arts of peace began to learn the art of war, and other millions were absorbed by factories making war goods, the nation was haunted by that question which it hardly dared to ask: What happens to all these people when the war stops? Have we got ourselves into a position where we have to keep the war going to keep from being thrown back into the miseries of another decade or more of mass unemployment?

The Delaware Conference was seeing clearly when it declared that the right of employment is essential to peace. If private industry cannot provide that employment, should the government assume the responsibility for it? What can the church do? Delaware continued:

In early years every individual has the right to full-time educational opportunities with reasonable consideration of his talents, interests and probable vocation. In later years every individual is entitled to economic security in retirement and the continuation of cultural oppor-

tunities. In the whole span of life every individual is entitled to adequate health service and professional medical care; and in the productive years there is the universal obligation to work in some socially necessary service.

This Delaware resolution was aimed at the two groups which have suffered most from the long pre-war depression—youth and age. While colleges and universities did increase their enrollment greatly during the depression, there were millions of youth who were denied the opportunity of higher education because they could not afford it. Even those who finished their schooling had a hard time to find work. Years of idleness before they could get a job often unfitted them to do their best when their opportunity came. At the other end of the life span, the elderly found themselves jobless without security. "Firing at forty" was a common practice.

The Delaware Conference believed that liberty and equality—the twin pillars of democracy—should undergird every realm of life. There should be, it held, economic equality and liberty of opportunity. Every man has a right to a job. There should be equality of opportunity for good health. Throughout his whole life every person, regardless of his means, should be entitled to adequate medical care. There should be educational democracy in that every youth should have the opportunity to obtain the best training he is able to use. There should be also an equality of security; the aged of every social stratum should equally be entitled to an adequate living so long as they need it.

Every man has the right to employment of a kind that is consistent with human dignity and self-respect, and to such leisure as is essential for cultural and spiritual development; employers of all kinds should recognize and safeguard these rights.

Delaware churchmen did not approve of "busy work" of the kind that characterized some WPA employment a few years ago. But their resolution went much further than that. Human dignity and self-respect cannot really be maintained in any employment that does not contribute to human welfare. What about the millions of people who have been employed in making useless gadgets, or useful things that are of inferior quality? Clothing, for example, is considered to be useful, and making clothing is an honorable employment. But does the making of sleazy and shoddy clothing contribute to self-respect?

Wartime employment offers an interesting suggestion in this connection. In time of war, the tendency is to withhold mate-

rials from industries of doubtful worth. A slot-machine company, for example, was the first to be denied the use of aluminum. Not only materials but men are steered into industries that contribute to the national effort. Priorities protect and promote the enterprises which are in accord with the national enterprise of carrying the war to a successful conclusion. Profits, which are the ruling purpose in ordinary times, assume a secondary role. Everything, in other words, is measured by its contribution to one central national purpose. The average citizen, taking his government's aims at their face value, finds or fails to find his self-respect in terms of whether or not he contributes to that all-encompassing aim.

This suggests that in the long run, human dignity and self-respect may be attained only by giving each individual the opportunity to contribute according to his abilities to a social aim worthy of his highest effort. Is war such a social objective? It is true, of course, that while the war continues the nation has a goal, an objective which can command general cooperative effort. But few people in the democracies would agree to that as a permanent purpose. **Is the building up of our own national community a sufficient objective? Is it possible to build up our own nation without also helping others? What should America's goals be? Is it impossible that one day a nation like ours will work as hard and be as unified in attempting to achieve a prosperous and peaceful world community as it now works to defend itself in war?**

II—Morality and the Business Cycle

IT WAS at this point that the delegates at Delaware turned to deal with one of the problems on which economists have been most divided. That is the problem of the business cycle. This is what they said:

> That citizens, through their governments or other appropriate agencies, have not only the right but the duty (a) to prevent destructive cyclical trends in business by regulatory measures, or, if these prove inadequate, by direct initiative; (b) to counteract the unemployment resulting from technological change through vocational re-education, through public employment agencies and, if necessary, through a reorganization of industries and markets.

The churchmen who met at Delaware knew that the economic cycle has a good deal to do with the bases of a just

and durable peace. The United States has twice in this century become involved in war following an economic depression. Perhaps it was just a coincidence. More likely, it was not.

Something can be done about the economic cycle. Right now we have evidence in plenty that war will pull a nation out of a slump—at least for a time. **If war can do it, isn't there some other kind of national effort that might do the same thing if we tried it? What kind of challenge will it take? Can the church voice it?**

The Delaware churchmen seemed to think that unemployment could be combated by public vocational re-education and public employment agencies. Well and good. But why cannot the church assume some responsibility along this line? In Chicago where the large Negro population has benefited little from the shortage of men for armament employment, a number of Negro churches have set up employment bureaus. When recently they made a concerted attack on "policy" gambling, they were prepared to find jobs for several thousands of Negroes who had found work in this demoralizing business. In New England a minister who had attacked in his sermon the "busy work" of the local WPA was told by a number of his parishioners who worked on WPA that they preferred private employment but had been unable to secure it. The minister then set out to help them. He found that it was not impossible and ended up by having an employment bureau as a permanent part of his church's service to the community. In the first few weeks, he found 55 jobs for members of his congregation.

What is the matter with the church taking some responsibility in this connection? Why does not your church try it?

III—Collective Responsibility in Industry

AND NOW we come to a section of the Delaware Findings that caused great debate. It will be vigorously opposed by many churchmen. But the delegates to the conference believed that it outlined the sort of industrial control necessary to a peaceful society. Here is the section in question:

> That industrial democracy is fundamental to successful political democracy, and we therefore recommend that labor be given an increasing responsibility for and participation in industrial management. The principle of democracy in economic relations should be accorded

wider expression by the development of stronger *voluntary* producers' associations, farm organizations, labor organizations, professional groups and consumers' organizations, and their integration into some form of national economic council, for planning in cooperation with government for maximum production and consumption and the abolition of unemployment. In each industry also, industrial councils should be developed, representative of management, labor and consumers, for democratic direction of industries towards these same ends. The effect of maximum production and consumption in each country would be to decrease the pressure of competition for world markets and thus to mitigate one of the major economic causes of war.

This important statement carries the principle of collective responsibility farther than any other part of the resolution. It envisages the organization of society into collective units. Producers, farmers, laborers, professional people and consumers would be organized into associations. These associations would be united into a national economic council to plan in cooperation with government for the abolition of unemployment. Each industry also would have an overhead council which would include management, labor and the consuming public. Each would be ruled by the same idea of abolishing unemployment.

It is to be noted that the organizations named are voluntary. They work in cooperation with government. Any scheme which is not voluntary makes such a plan only a more perfect method of regimentation. Voluntary cooperation requires that in such an arrangement, the representatives of both labor and management should have real—not nominal—freedom of choice. If both are at the mercy of government, then that which set out to be an instrument of peace ends by becoming a more efficient regimentation for war.

In recommending that labor be given increasing responsibility for and participation in industrial management, Delaware took what many will regard as its most challengeable position. It is to be noted that the delegates did it because they held that "industrial democracy is fundamental to successful political democracy." Perhaps, however, this position is not as radical as it seems. Collective bargaining, long accepted as a sound principle in British and Scandinavian democracies, is a long step in that direction. Further, the Delaware churchmen were not going beyond what the Malvern Conference said. It voted: "This status of man as man, independently of the economic process, must find expression in the managerial framework of industry; the rights of labor must

be recognized as in principle equal to those of capital in the control of industry whatever the means by which this transformation is effected."

Is every step toward collective action necessarily a contribution to the regimentation of the state for war? What is more important, the right to vote or the right to strike? Granted that labor lacks experience in the problems of management, how can they gain experience without responsibility? Will such experience tend to moderate or to make more extreme the demands of labor on management?

IV—Taxation as a Leveler

TAXATION, said the Delaware Conference, should be used not only for revenue but also as an economic leveling-rod.

> We cannot find the means of preventing social disorder until we have ended the paradox of poverty in the midst of plenty. We believe that a tax program should be formulated in such a way that the burden be placed in proportion to the ability to pay, to the end that our wealth may be more equitably distributed.

The principle of proportionate responsibility is one which will be agreed to be a sound one. However, does this principle not imply that an absolute upper limit must be set on income? Even though a millionaire *may* be required to surrender in taxes 95 per cent of his income, does not his remaining 5 per cent perpetuate the inequities which existed before? In England we understand that the present tax program sets a mandatory upper limit on income. Should it be adopted here for the duration of the war? What should be the standard or goal of this equalization?

V—The Farmer and the Peace

THE Delaware Conference was strongly city-minded. Concerning the relationship of agriculture to world peace it voted:

> That agriculture has a dual importance, both as a way of making a living and as a basis of family and community life. Our economic system must become servant and

not master in maintaining the socially significant services of agriculture, such as feeding the world and producing the organic raw materials essential to industry.

For some further directions in which the conference might have examined the relationship of agriculture to durable peace the following questions offer suggestions:

What kind of control must be set up over internationally competitive farm products like cotton and wheat if world economy is to be stabilized?

What is the relationship between such products of tropical agriculture as copra and rubber and the colonial problem? If colonies are to be abolished, what can be offered in the place of the present system which will yet promote peace?

Is it possible to control ruinous inflation and get economic stability without establishing a ceiling over farm prices? On what basis should that ceiling be established?

VI—International Labor Office

ONE of the most important actions of the International Labor Office of the League of Nations was the working out of conventions or agreements between two or more states concerning hours and wages in competitive industries. These agreements were instrumental in stabilizing competition and raising the standard of living of many millions of workers. The I.L.O. worked with a view to establishing the living standards at the highest rather than the lowest level, as they would have been if unrestricted competition were to have prevailed.

In the present war labor standards have suffered in all countries. Japanese industries were running twelve hours a day before Pearl Harbor and hours will probably be lengthened if such lengthening does not invoke the law of diminishing returns. When the war is over strenuous efforts must be made in every country if standards are to be restored, and some agency must serve as the international clearinghouse to see that no one country is undercut by another when it attempts to restore national standards.

Delaware chose to emphasize only one of the functions of the International Labor Office when it said:

> In view of the Christian principle that a house divided against itself cannot stand, we urge that the International Labor Organization or its successor organization after the war shall make a special study of all available plans for

avoiding or reducing the animosities too often prevailing between labor and management and tending to national inefficiency and war.

When the war is over, through what method will nations determine hours of labor in internationally competitive industries like textiles? What would you consider adequate qualifications for a man or woman to represent the United States in the International Labor Office?

VII—Tariffs and War

THE Delaware churchmen advocated "the progressive elimination of retrictions on world trade such as tariffs and quotas, under the guidance of an international organization and by other appropriate methods."

This was one point at which the pre-war policy of the United States came under favorable review. Secretary Hull's trade agreements were bilateral undertakings designed to place trade between ourselves and the bargaining nation on a "most favored nation basis." That is, each agreed to give to the other the treatment it gave the nation it had given the most advantages in trade. There was usually an agreement as to just what duties would be charged on given articles, the list sometimes reaching many thousands. The conference at Delaware recognized that trade restrictions had been an important contributing cause of war. "Where goods cannot go, soldiers must" is an old dictum which history has sadly underlined in recent years.

The most definitive statement of war aims yet made by Britain and America was the Atlantic Charter, agreed to between President Roosevelt and Prime Minister Churchill in August 1941. The churchmen who met at Delaware approved of its clause concerning economic collaboration, but urged that the reservations implied in it be reconsidered. In other words, they were prepared to go further than the promulgators of the doctrine. They said:

> "The fullest collaboration between all nations in the economic field with the object of securing *for all* improved labor standards, economic advancement and social security." This is the language of the Atlantic Charter, Article 5. We call attention however to the fact that in Article 4 of this Charter, the obligation "to further the enjoyment by all states, great or small, victor or vanquished, of access on equal terms to the trade and raw materials of the world which are needed for their eco-

nomic prosperity," is limited by the phrase "with due respect for their existing obligations." We urge that such existing obligations be modified so as to permit the complete achievement of the goal set forth in this same Article. We hold that in all this matter the rights and needs of indigenous populations should be given just consideration.

It is to be noted that these provisions were regarded as necessary regardless of the outcome of the war and were to apply to all, victor and vanquished. In this matter there must be no economic penalties against the defeated nations as there were after Versailles. "Access on equal terms to the trade and raw materials of the world which are needed for their economic prosperity" will, if it means anything, have to include all countries. **Will this be safe? Is it likely to lead to further war? What is the alternative?**

VIII—Money and Durable Peace

MONEY, if not the root of all evil to those at Delaware, was at least the source of much ill will and confusion. They therefore favored:

> The establishment of a universal system of money. The money system should be so planned as to prevent inflation and deflation, insofar as this is possible through monetary means.

The Malvern Conference was a little less sweeping. Perhaps it was a little more realistic. Malvern accepted money as only a symbol of value, not the value itself. It is unimportant to peace whether nations have one currency or many so long as the status of currencies relative to one another remains constant. So Malvern recommended "that the monetary system be so administered that what the community can produce is made available to the members of the community, the satisfaction of human needs being accepted as the only true end of production."

Are these two statements contradictory? Do we have inflation now? Why is it considered a calamity?

The Delaware churchmen recommended the formation of a democratically-controlled international bank or banks to make development capital available in all parts of the world without the predatory or imperialistic aftermath so characteristic of large-scale private or governmental loans. This opens up some interesting lines of speculation: **Where**

will the capital for this international banking system come from? If it comes from private investors, how will it differ from previous imperialistic experiments of this kind? If it comes from governments, what will happen to the democratic control? What will be the back-log of security of this international currency? Will this be the final destination of the gold buried at Fort Knox in Kentucky, where a large proportion of the world's supply has found its resting place? If gold is to be the backing of world-currency it must be *our* gold. If it is our gold, what terms should the United States ask before turning it over?

IX—How Feed So Many Mouths?

A DECADE ago a liberal Japanese statesman said that he was frightened every time he saw another Japanese child. What he meant was that the population of Japan was growing at the rate of nearly a million a year and he feared what this meant for the future peace of Asia. Each year some 400,000 additional jobs had to be found for new hands which had reached working age and the little islands of Japan could not supply them. He was a man of peace and he knew what the military leaders, then in a minority, intended to do if they had a chance.

So Delaware recommended:

> The creation of a world organization to study and make recommendations concerning problems arising from the pressure of population on the means of subsistence. We condemn any attempt upon the part of any nation to solve these problems by measures that discriminate against any people because of race or creed.

The United States has a number of immigration laws which shut out of this country Japanese, Chinese, Indians and Filipinos. The reasons given in the laws and court decisions which are the basis of their exclusion are racial reasons.

Could the Delaware Conference have been thinking of these? Or was it thinking of similar laws in Canada? Or was it referring to the "white Australia" policy which has kept that big continent, as large as the United States and with a population of only seven millions, for the white race only, when 1,000 millions of peoples of color, Malay, Indian, Chinese and Japanese, are struggling for a living within their crowded lands only a few days' sailing distance away?

X—Peace and Plenty Through Mutual Aid

THAT "the strong ought to bear the burdens of the weak" has always been accepted as basic to Christian responsibility. In economic terms the Delaware Conference believed that this means immediately giving the utmost possible aid to stricken nations after the war. It declared:

> We believe that wealthy nations should not only refrain from action that is injurious to their neighbors, but should initiate action that is calculated to benefit their neighbors, as for example, the direction of foreign investments with a view to raising the standard of living of the underprivileged peoples of the earth. No attempt should be made, however, to *impose* an alien culture upon any people.
>
> We recognize that at the close of the war vast populations will be in need of food, shelter, clothing and medical care, and that vast areas will call for physical and economic rehabilitation. We believe that the American people, acting through their government, should assume a major share of the responsibility and task of meeting this need.

Is gratitude a more powerful motive than resentment? If bitterness over the hunger blockade which followed the last war helped to produce the present struggle, is it possible that appreciation for unexpected and undeserved generosity and help will at the end of this war produce the opposite result? Is this a practical application of the principle of the Cross? Or is it plain foolishness?

Since many recent trade agreements have been made with South American countries as a part of the Good Neighbor policy, the conference took particular and favorable note of their fruitage in a recent inter-American conference at Rio de Janeiro:

> We note such acts of our government as that reported by Under Secretary of State Welles at Rio de Janeiro on January 15, 1942, that "It is the policy of the United States to aid in maintaining the economic stability of the other American republics by recognizing and providing for their essential civilian needs on the basis of equal and proportionate consideration with our own"; also the provisions of Article 7 of the Anglo-American Pact of February 26, 1942, calling for "post-war participation, by all countries of like mind, directed to the expansion, by ap-

propriate international and domestic measures, of production, employment and exchanging consumption of goods which are the material foundations of the liberty and welfare of all peoples; to the elimination of all forms of discriminatory treatment in international commerce and to the reduction of tariffs and other trade barriers." We instruct the officers of this conference to communicate to our government our deep satisfaction with such acts. The spirit evidenced thereby is, in our judgment, that which must come to permeate the life of nations if they are to achieve a just and durable peace.

Chapter Seven

The Social Bases of a Just and Durable Peace

CHRISTIANS are urged in the Bible to judge the "signs of the times." What is the meaning of the present crisis? Christian thought makes its own diagnosis, based on principles by which the rise and fall of peoples have been measured for thousands of years. "The war is not to be regarded as an isolated evil detached from the general conditions of Western civilization during the last period," declared the British churchmen who met at Malvern. "Rather it is to be seen as one symptom of a widespread disease and maladjustment resulting from loss of conviction concerning the reality and character of God and the true nature and destiny of man."

Meeting a year after Malvern, when the world conflict had struck even more serious blows at the international order we have known, when bastions of empire had fallen and historic allegiances had been shattered by armed might, the Delaware Conference was prepared to speak an even clearer word concerning the meaning of the crisis. The first sentences of its far-reaching pronouncement on the "Social Bases of a Just and Durable Peace" represented a triumph of faith.

> We are convinced that the present struggle of the nations is not just another war in the history of mankind. It is the upheaval of the old order and the birth of a new. The relationships of men will never again be the same, nor should they be the same, for they have not been founded on the eternal truths of God.

Therefore we affirm that whatever peace settlements are presented to the peoples of the world should express the following principles:

1. Man is a child of God and all men are brothers one of another. The church in its long-established missionary work recognizes its responsibility to bring all men into full relationship as children of God.

2. Mankind is one in nature and in the sight of God. No group of men is inherently superior or inferior to any other, and none is above any other beloved of God.

3. The whole earth is given by God and to all men for their common dwelling place, and the resources of the earth should be used as his gifts to the whole human family.

4. All men should be free to move over the surface of the earth under international agreement, in search of the fullest opportunity for personal development.

5. Freedom of religious worship, of speech and assembly, of the press, of the arts, and of scientific inquiry and teaching should be available to all men everywhere.

I—One God Over All

CHURCH PEOPLE are always in danger of assenting too easily to this simple formulation of the basic Christian faith concerning the relation of man to man. These principles are profoundly revolutionary and when they are taken seriously they effect a basic change in our accepted standards. The Delaware Conference has rendered a genuine service in reducing them to terms which are easily remembered. It would be a salutary thing if this statement were memorized by thousands of Christians and recited every time a group small or large assembles to consider the social basis of a just and durable peace.

"Man is a child of God and all men are brothers one of another." Like Peter of old, this affirmation rises up in the midst of a world at war to rebuke the limitations which nationalism puts on our responsibility for our brothers whom now we think of only as enemies. "Love your enemies" means then loving your brothers. Since there is one God, there can be only one community of mankind. The church through its missionary program has been acting as though that were true.

Under God all men are equally beloved. There are no "chosen people"—none inherently destined to rule the world by reason of superiority of blood. This doctrine is as hostile to the idea of the "white man's burden" by which Kipling

justified imperialist conquest as it is to the Japanese idea of the world being ruled by a race of gods, the Japanese, or to the nazi conception of Aryan superiority. The unity of mankind is a corollary to the Christian belief in one God.

"God hath made of one every nation of men to dwell on all the face of the earth." (Acts 17:26.) So the Apostle Paul boldly proclaimed this fundamental Christian doctrine when he stood up to address the philosophers of Athens—the proudest "intelligentsia" of his day. As an inescapable corollary of that truth it follows that no nation has a right before God to claim a corner on any major item of the world's resources simply on the ground that it is a favorite of the Almighty. The Almighty has no favorites; his providence is for all. **What does this do to the favored standard of living of the American people?**

II—Christianity Champions Freedom

SEVEN freedoms were designated by the Delaware Conference as essential to living as Christians. They were freedom of religious worship, speech, assembly, press, of arts, scientific inquiry and teaching.[1] If industrial labor had been represented at Delaware, it would probably have added an eighth: freedom of organization. President Roosevelt would have added freedom from want and fear. **What is more important: that freedoms be verbally affirmed or that they be practiced? How many of these freedoms are honored in time of war? Can there be any abiding freedom unless there is a just and durable peace?**

The Delaware Conference also spoke out in behalf of another kind of freedom whose importance to a lasting peace is too often overlooked. That is freedom of movement. Its statement on this issue is the one numbered 4 in the quotation on page 61.

Freedom of movement has been greatly restricted since 1914. Before then passports were not necessary for travel in Europe or in most countries. People passed back and forth across frontiers without difficulty or bother. Now international travel outside of the Americas is made almost impossible for most people. The fullest personal development and the restoration of international friendship necessitates freedom of movement. That applies not only to individuals visiting a

[1]Note that the Delaware Findings on the Social Bases of peace included one more "freedom" than was named in the Statement of General Principles (Chapter Two). Notice the nature of the added "freedom" demanded above.

"foreign" land who wish to return to their own country, but even more to the right of large numbers of people to seek to improve their lot by migration. Taking seriously this Delaware statement would require that countries such as ours would have to revise the immigration laws which are designed to prevent others from coming to this land in search of opportunity for larger life.

Do you regard the present immigration laws of the United States as in accord with Christian principles? If not, in what respect do you think they should be changed?

III—Post-War Responsibility for Relief and Rehabilitation

WHEN this war is over, the American people will feel thoroughly exhausted. With vast cuts in goods available for civilian use, with unprecedented taxes drastically reducing the income of the poor as well as the rich, it takes no prophet to see that the end of the war will give rise to a "back to normalcy" movement which will make the similar reaction at the end of the First World War weak by comparison. As a nation we shall not only be caught under the necessity of giving attention to our wounds but we shall also be impoverished and forced to repair our fortunes. The "American standard of living" as we have known it will be a memory for a long time to come, but when the present wartime necessity for its reduction is gone, that memory will provide a powerful political impetus for a return to national economic policies which promise a quick return to luxury and high incomes for Americans without giving a thought to the destruction those policies may cause in other countries.

In the light of this situation, what will be the response of Christian America to the starvation of millions of people in war-seared lands? What can we do and what will we want to do about the vast need for reconstruction of the shattered homes of tens of millions? Already whole nations of neutrals are sinking into slow death by famine and as the arbitrament of the sword begins to incline the war toward one side or the other, hunger will apply its cruel lash to the defeated. With the destruction of homes in England alone already equal to the entire property destruction in all countries in the First World War, multiplying air armadas now building insure that the homes of untold millions in many lands will require rebuilding. Every report of the spread of typhus or yellow fever or influenza or other war-bred diseases—and these reports are on the increase—is greeted with dread by the med-

ical authorities, for these doctors know how likely undernourished people are to contract and spread such diseases until they become epidemics that circle the globe. **Will America be able—will America be willing—under these circumstances to meet the post-war need of the world for food, medical care, shelter, rehabilitation?**

That depends, in the judgment of the Delaware Conference, largely on what we do under present circumstances.

> The present mass suffering of the world requires action on the part of the church in America far beyond anything yet undertaken. Six million young men in the prison camps of the world; scores of millions of refugees —homeless, helpless, starving; whole regions subjected to slow starvation as a result of the policies of states—these and kindred areas of desperate suffering inflicted upon masses of innocent victims challenge the church to a demonstration of its basic doctrines of human solidarity and brotherhood in a potential family of God. They provide potent opportunities for creating even now, in the midst of war, responses of good will and solid grounds for enduring fellowship.

IV—What Can We Do Now?

THE CHURCHMEN who met at Delaware were prepared to be specific concerning what the church ought to do about this present and emerging need. They said:

> To rise adequately to a sense of its God-given mission, the church must:
>
> 1. Make vivid in the consciousness of its entire membership the awful reality of this agony—mass in extent, but personal in intensity.
>
> 2. Provide continual opportunity for material giving on the part of every member, to the point of genuine sacrifice, as a requisite of Christian living.
>
> 3. Recognize cooperating agencies approved by the Committee on Foreign Relief Appeals in the Churches as existing channels for a world-wide ministry of compassion.

These eight approved agencies with their addresses and the needs they attempt to fill are:

1. *The War Prisoner's Aid Fund* of the International Y.M.C.A., 347 Madison Avenue, New York, is heading work among war prisoners. It is serving British prisoners in Ger-

many and German prisoners in Canada, Japanese prisoners in America and American prisoners in Japan and China. It needs help as already there are more than 6,000,000 prisoners to be served.

2. *The Central Bureau for Relief of the Evangelical Churches of Europe* is located in Geneva, Switzerland, and can be reached through the American office of the Universal Christian Council, Henry S. Leiper, secretary, 297 Fourth Avenue, New York. It assists stricken Protestant churches in Europe and helps with relief problems for their members, prisoners' aid, refugee aid, etc.

3. *The Church Committee for China Relief,* 105 East 22nd Street, New York, is still getting large amounts of help through to allay the famine which prevails in considerable areas in China and to provide medical care for those who need it. All administration is done without cost through missionary auspices. The needs are far greater than they are able to answer. They need help.

4. *The American Bible Society,* Park Avenue & 57th Street, New York, is supplying Scriptures to soldiers and prisoners of war, some of whom, like the Russians, have never had access to the Bible before. It is also taking over as much of the responsibilities of the British and Foreign Bible Society in mission lands as it can.

5. *The American Friends Service Committee,* 20 South 12th Street, Philadelphia, is actively engaged in feeding tens of thousands of children who would otherwise starve in the occupied countries of Europe. Other famine sufferers also benefit. It needs contributions of money and clothing.

6. *The Y.W.C.A. World Emergency Fund* is doing work for women and girls in a number of countries. It is also increasing its activity at home as larger numbers of women engage in war industry. Address: 600 Lexington Avenue, New York.

7. *The American Committee for Christian Refugees* is an active agency aiding European refugees to resettle if possible or at least to live until a way opens for them to resume their livelihood. Address: 297 Fourth Avenue, New York.

8. *The International Missionary Council,* 156 Fifth Avenue, New York, is the clearinghouse for aid for "orphaned missions." In the last two years it has raised $1,600,000 to enable missions cut off from their former sources of support to continue their work. Now that the war has spread to other missionary lands, the needs it seeks to meet are greater than ever.

If we do not find ways of responding to these and other calls upon our sympathy now during the war, while the economic situation is as favorable for the average man as it now is, we may be sure that we will not do more at the end of

the war. We may therefore project a curve from what we are now doing into the future to see what answer history will give to the question: How did Christian America, in comparative terms rich beyond all other peoples, respond to the need of war-cursed humanity at the end of the Second World War? **What share is your church taking in seeing that that curve rises in the right direction?**

Under present conditions, all former obligations of the churches are exceeded. New demands, according to Delaware, may not be ignored. Among these it listed:

> Recognize responsibilities for cooperation with government in areas of rehabilitation which concern the church but transcend its normal functions. Such areas include the moving of populations, the restoration of the cultural life of peoples, the resettling of refugees, the return and rehabilitation of prisoners of war, and the reintegration into civilian life of men in the armed forces and the civilian public service camps.

Since the Delaware Conference adjourned, for example, some 100,000 Japanese have been ordered to leave their places of residence on the west coast of the United States and to move into army-ruled camps inland. Thousands of them are Christians. More than half are American citizens—born in this country of Japanese parentage. Time and again the Supreme Court has ruled that it is a fundamental purpose of our Constitution to see that no citizen is deprived of his property without due process of law. Most of the aliens among these Japanese are aliens simply because our laws forbid them to become citizens. The story of the French Acadians, immortalized in Longfellow's *Evangeline,* is being repeated on a far larger scale.

The Delaware Conference found itself unable to recommend what to do about the millions of starving people of the small democracies of Europe. Caught between the blockade and the counter-blockade, their people are dying by thousands. The Delaware churchmen confessed to having the matter on their consciences, but all they could recommend was that the Federal Council continue to work with government to see what could be done. Meanwhile the people starve! The resolution was:

> The malnutrition and slow starvation of millions of innocent victims of war in conquered countries is heavy upon our Christian consciences. Although we have not reached agreement as to immediate remedial measures to be urged upon governments, we request the Federal Council of Churches to continue its exploration with the

governmental authorities with a view to finding practicable means for alleviating these situations.

If you had been at the Delaware Conference, would you have been satisfied with this resolution? Or would you have recommended something else as a more Christian proposal?

V—Get Ready for the War's End!

THE CHURCHES must however prepare to face the newer and larger opportunities which will open at the end of the war. Delaware's advice was:

> Prepare now for the tasks of rehabilitation at the end of the war. Such preparations might well include the following:
>
> (a) Relate present war relief giving to the continuing need which the end of the war will not terminate but only more clearly reveal.
>
> (b) Develop courses and emphases in church schools and young people's programs regarding the problems of reconstruction which will prepare our youth for their responsibility. Specialized training should be provided for those people who may be called to serve in reconstruction abroad.
>
> (c) Urge missionary societies to maintain intact, so far as is possible, their field organizations and personnel for large scale and effective reconstruction.
>
> (d) Ask missionary agencies to emphasize a thorough grounding in the technique of relief and rehabilitation for all candidates in training for missionary service.

What can be done about these recommendations in your own church? Is there a concrete contribution you can make toward "winning the peace—in your church?"

VI—Toward the World Community

TECHNOLOGY has made the world into a neighborhood. War has made that neighborhood into a slaughterhouse. Can Christianity convert that slaughterhouse into a community?

There is no way to go back, even though we might desire to do so. The airplane cannot fly from the present into the

past and dis-invent itself. The radio cannot turn back the voices of yesterday until it speaks no more. The contrivances by which we communicate and travel, produce and distribute, cannot of themselves invent brains and then blow them out in technological suicide. To escape the self-destruction which we are now inflicting on ourselves with the aid of these devices, we must in some way create the desire and discover the way to live together in peace—in community.

The emergence of a world community was dimly foreseen by the Delaware Conference. Through the voice of faith it proclaimed its belief that the nation-state is being profoundly and essentially modified by the war. The delegates affirmed their conviction that national cultures are of permanent value and should not be sacrificed to gain any superficial unity.

> The nations of the world are passing through the crucible of fire and sword. National cultures which have enriched and given meaning to millions of people are in danger of extinction. No nation can escape this crisis. Those nations which, amid the purifying days of suffering, rediscover or preserve their souls from disintegration under the heel of the invader, from the despair of defeat, or from the pride and boastfulness of victory, will be ready to reconstruct their own national life and that of the world upon the ruins of today.
>
> The sovereign power of the nation-state is being modified by economic, political, and military forces which demand a new social order. It will be impossible to return to such extreme practices of national sovereignty as have prevailed during recent decades. We believe that the state is a form of political organization which can and should be modified to meet the needs of the peoples of the world in the emerging situation. At the same time, however, we believe that different peoples have their distinctive places in the divine economy and that any world must look toward unity in diversity and not to general internationalism and cosmopolitanism. If we would avoid a superficial solution to the world's needs, we must come to recognize the distinction between those cultural values that center around the people, or folk, on the one hand, and the political state and government on the other.

Is the statement that national sovereignty is being essentially modified true in your judgment?

A British writer recently declared that European nationalism is turning in on itself—that is, asserting its cultural value at the very time when politically it is being overwhelmed by the German political unification of the

Continent. Is this true? Is it a good or a bad thing? Can the world community exist without political institutions—that is, a world government?

Is there a world Christian community, or does it require a world church before it can become a reality?

We, the members of the American churches, and a part of the world-wide Christian community, believe that the Christian churches in those countries where they are an inherent part of the nation's life, have a task to perform not only in helping to preserve and restore the national spiritual unity of their people but also in relating their people to the larger family of nations.

We believe that no matter what world scheme for political and economic organization may be devised to meet the demands of the modern world, at the heart of such a plan there must be developed an "international ethos" which not only springs from the loyalties of the people to their own nation, but includes their relationship to the welfare of mankind as a whole.

We believe that the Christian church, because of its universal gospel, its positive world-view and its deep concern for both the individual and the nation stands on the threshold of its greatest opportunity to bear witness to the reality of the world Christian community and to manifest in sacrificial living a spirit through which a suffering broken humanity can be transformed into a world community.

The churches have already made a start at the creation of a world community. Through the missionary movement they have planted in each land the seeds of the great society which will one day include all nations.

Is the message of the church one of international peace or of universal brotherhood? Did Jesus lay down principles of statecraft through which rulers might receive help in deciding affairs of politics, or did he rather point toward a way of life for men? Was Jesus a nationalist? If he did not center his message in terms of national affairs, does that mean that Christians should refuse to have anything to do with politics, or that they should use politics to produce as much as possible of the true and noble achievements and universal values about which Jesus was concerned?

The world community must rest upon the spiritual foundation of common agreement concerning basic moral principles if it is to last. According to the statement adopted at the World Conference of Churches at Oxford, England, in 1937, "All law, international as well as national, must be

based on a common ethos—that is, a common foundation of moral convictions. To the creation of such a common foundation in moral conviction the church as a supra-national society with a profound sense of the historical realities and of the world of human personality, has a great contribution to make." (From the *Message to the Churches of the World* of the World Conference of Churches, Oxford, 1937.)

"The building of a better international order," said the Study department of the World Council of Churches last year, "will depend on the possibility of creating a deeper sense of obligation for each other in the life of all nations. National sovereignty must find its counterbalance and limitation in international solidarity. Without that sense of obligation it will be impossible to arrive at a large scale solution of such complex problems as the problems of minorities and nationalities, or of the problem of colonies and raw materials. Moreover the possibility of undertaking great common tasks in an international manner, such as the opening up of new areas of colonization and of solving the problem of refugees, cannot be answered unless a new consciousness of international responsibility can be created.

"But how is that sense of international responsibility to be created in a world where common norms have been or are being destroyed, in which men who have come to despair of the attempts at establishing supra-national forces are preaching that loyalty to nation, state and class must be exclusive and ultimate? In view of the disproportion which exists between the consciousness of a common Christian ethos which is only slowly being born in the churches and the historical task with which we are confronted, dare the churches pretend that they can create such an ethos? Dare we share the expectation, which finds expression in many quarters, that 'out of this chaos there shall be a rebirth of Christendom' and dare we make that expectation the basis of our planning concerning the future? Or is that expectation an illusion which is likely to make us blind to the full seriousness of the situation?"

"Ethos" is a professorial-sounding sort of word. You will find it in the unabridged dictionaries, but it has been some time since you heard your precinct captain or your assemblyman use it. However, there's nothing very difficult about its meaning. What it means is simply the group of principles or ideas or beliefs that is held in common and thus characterizes the whole group. When the Delaware delegates talked about the need for an "international ethos," therefore, what they had in mind is the need to get people in all nations to think with a common international point of view.

Do you think there is any such "international ethos" today? Can there ever be in a world as divided as this?

Are we making progress in that direction or away from it?

VII—Principles for Further Study

ON THE SUBJECT of the world Christian community, the Delaware Conference voted to recommend among some of the problems for further study by church people the following statements:

1. The highest ethical principles which in their operation have hitherto been limited to community and national relationships should now be so extended as to apply in the field of international relations.

This recommendation assumed that nations can act ethically. There is a powerful school of theological thought which maintains that self-interest is the only law which nations can be expected to follow consistently. Men may be capable of moral action but societies of men are certain to be immoral or amoral. On the other hand, there are others who say that the church itself is an example of a society whose principles are higher than those of its members, and that collectives of men are capable of showing extraordinary selflessness and sacrificial strength. **Which is right? Is the United States at war for self-interest alone? May we ever hope that the strong will bear the burdens of the weak?**

Can any loyalty be higher than loyalty to one's own nation? Nationalism is perhaps the most powerful social cement in the modern world. It has brought people together in the greatest nations the world has seen and united their loyalties so that they are capable of the extraordinary exertions and sacrifices of war. The world community must ask an equal or greater loyalty—a patriotism of humanity. Thomas Paine, one of the great Americans of the early years of the republic, once said: "My country is the world; my countrymen, all mankind." Is it too much to ask of Christian faith that it believe that the day will come when that will be the common creed of mankind? The Delaware Conference recommended that we study this statement:

2. The problem confronting the world is how to substitute for the idea of self-preservation of the individual state a concept of world order which will recognize the primary importance of the society of nations, and the principle that the good of the whole takes precedence over the good of the part, since the highest and ultimate

good of the part is itself so largely conditioned by the good of the whole.

The delegates at Delaware also recommended that we study the following statement:

> 3. Whatever may be the political, economic or military form of world organization, for the preservation of a just and durable peace, the rights and duties of peoples to maintain their full cultural freedom must be preserved.

In this connection a difficult problem arises. One of the greatest needs of the post-war period will be that of re-education. The youth of totalitarian countries have had their minds distorted by the kind of education they have received. It is this education which has convinced them that "man is war," that the highest glory of man is to die in battle, that their particular race is destined to dominate the world. In the interest of world peace such education must be countered with large doses of truth concerning other people mixed with deeper insights into the moral laws which alone make life together on this planet possible.

Can this re-education be done voluntarily, preserving the full cultural freedom of the nation requiring the re-education? Do we need a bit of re-education ourselves?

The Delaware Conference was mindful of the way in which Christians in many lands are sacrificing at great cost to maintain the world-wide Christian fellowship. It said:

> Many of the Christian churches in the lands of the conquerors and the conquered have during tragic days remained faithful to the Master. With the central message of the Cross, they have succored the souls of their peoples and have kept them from despair. They have pointed to the God-imposed duty of every people, no matter how small or how large, of whatever race or creed, to go the way of repentance, obedience and complete consecration to His will.

What do you know about the course of the churches in Germany, in Finland, in Norway, in China, in Japan during this war? Do you regard these as true Christian churches? Has their record in time of war been more Christian, or less, than that of American churches?

VIII—Brotherly Race Relations and Peace

THE PRINCIPAL ARGUMENT used by the Japanese propaganda in East Asia is that their armies will free Asia from the insufferable arrogance of the white man's

racism. The Japanese claim that the liberation of the peoples of color from white domination is their aim. They ask help from others of the darker races in this endeavor. While the Chinese have known from bitter experience that this propaganda provides a cloak for other aims less worthy, the peoples of Thailand, Indo-China, Malaysia and particularly Burma have not been so wise. Many of them have believed that this is a true picture of the situation and have joined the Japanese in fifth column work and in other ways.

There can be no doubt that there is substance to the claim of the Japanese. The white communities which ruled Shanghai, Hongkong, Manila and Singapore were racially snobbish to an extreme degree. Resentment against indignities remembered over a long time provide the driving force for armies who exact a revenge multiplied many times.

The Japanese delegation to the Paris Peace Conference was instructed by its government to have written into the Covenant of the League of Nations a declaration of racial equality. They failed, due principally to objections by representatives of England and the United States. Because so many Americans have forgotten all about this incident, which has had effects which persist to this day, it should be of interest to recall the exact language of the declaration which the Japanese vainly tried to get into the Covenant of the League:

"The equality of nations being a basic principle of the League of Nations, the high contracting parties agree to accord, as soon as possible, to all alien nations of states members of the League, equal and just treatment in every respect, making no distinction, either in law or fact, on account of their race or nationality."

The Delaware Conference was poignantly aware of the importance of the race factor in any possible peace. It said:

> Among the primary factors in the maintenance of a just and durable peace will be equitable treatment of all racial groups that make up the world's population. Therefore the securing of justice now for racial groups is essential if America is to make its full contribution in securing a just and durable peace.
>
> We acknowledge with profound contrition the sin of racial discrimination in American life and our own share, though we are Christians, in the common guilt. So long as our attitudes and policies deny peoples of other races in our own or other lands the essential position of brothers in the common family of mankind we cannot safely be trusted with the making of a just and durable peace.

In our own country millions of people, especially American Negroes, are subjected to discrimination and unequal treatment in educational opportunities, in employment, wages and conditions of work, in access to professional and business opportunities, in housing, in transportation, in the administration of justice and even in the right to vote. We condemn all such inequalities and call upon our fellow Christians and fellow citizens to initiate and support measures to establish equality of status and treatment of members of minority racial and cultural groups.

Some local current outrages that have national significance and therefore international effects in the attitudes of other peoples are the recent Missouri lynching and the rioting in Detroit over the Sojourner Truth Housing Project.

In Chicago where 7,000 Negroes had been trained at government expense for defense jobs and factories are clamoring for help, only 700 Negroes were able to find jobs. This is only one illustration of the discrimination which is being widely practiced today in America. So Delaware voted:

We commend the President of the United States for his executive action directed toward the elimination of discrimination in industry and the public services against Negroes and persons of other racial and national origin. We urge that in further pursuit of this policy Negro Americans be given suitable recognition in the administrative and judicial departments of the government.

Negroes cannot get into the navy except as mess attendants and in similar menial jobs. Only a few Negroes have ever been officers in the army, and only a few have been able to get training as air pilots. Many economic opportunities are closed to them.

But what have the churches to say when they practice segregation within their own membership? Are we in position to advise the nation when we have an unsolved problem which we are in position to remedy but do not do so?

The Delaware Conference was prepared to face this anomaly. The delegates did not dodge or equivocate. Here is what they said:

We call our fellow Christians to witness that it is in the nature of the church that Negro men and women and those belonging to other racial and national minorities should be welcomed into the membership, administrative personnel, and fellowship of our churches, local and na-

tional. We urge individual Christians and the corporate body of the Church of Christ to take up the cross of courageous service in action which deals with the problems of race and color in our land.

That is far-reaching talk. But the Delaware Conference bound nobody. Each delegate was there as an individual and his actions committed only himself. Nevertheless this action is important in that it shows what men really think ought to be done.

The real importance of this resolution will be seen only in the local churches. Do Protestant churches have the right to deny membership to anybody on the sole grounds of color? Perhaps the fact that they widely do so offers some of the explanation why the Catholic Church, which practices no such discrimination, is gaining in membership rapidly in parts of the country which formerly were strongly Protestant.

The first great controversy in the history of the Christian church dealt with the question of race. It was fought out over the question as to whether prospective members would first have to become Jews—taking on Jewish ritual obligations —before they would be allowed to become Christians. Paul of Tarsus stood steadfastly behind the thesis that in Christ there is neither Jew nor Greek, male nor female, bond nor free, but all are one. Delaware said:

> The modern confusion of culture and race has grown out of the belief that culture is a product of biological heredity and that Anglo-European culture is superior because it has sprung from superior human strains. We believe that all racial groups have contributed outstanding cultural gifts to civilization and that the exchange of such gifts has enriched all mankind. A just and durable peace should provide and insist upon a framework that allows more opportunity for creative expression of all groups and for greater exchange of such cultural creations in the field of music, art, medicine and literature. Assimilation of culture does not mean amalgamation of racial stocks.

Race, as Jacques Barzun has pointed out, is the "modern superstition." In its modern forms, it began with a Frenchman named Gobineau, who in 1853 published a book called *The Inequality of Races* to explain the rise and fall of civilizations. He was the father of the theory of the "yellow peril" and of many of the nazi ideas of the superiority of the white race. Skin color, according to him, determines mental and spiritual differences between men. "Mixture of blood" produces degeneracy and the decline and fall of civilizations.

All this is completely without scientific verification, yet it is held by millions of people.

The churches organized by missionaries are all without racial bars. Is it not time that the churches should learn from their own representatives and practice what they preach?

Chapter Eight

A Just and Durable Peace

A Review

TWENTY-NINE religious bodies appointed 377 delegates to represent them in the Second National Study Conference of Churches on a Just and Durable Peace. We have studied their reports item by item. Now we should recall the central purpose which guided the conference and undergirds the churches in their quest for a just and lasting peace. It was succinctly stated in the preamble to the general report. We suggest that the leader of your group read it aloud.

> The period through which we are passing is the most revolutionary in world history, when we take into account the vastness of the areas affected. A familiar order of life is hastening to a close and none can predict the shape of things to come. When the present conflict is over, and irrespective of which side wins in the struggle, the world that we know will be radically altered, for better or for worse. That being so, all discussion of a future peace settlement, if it is to be germane to the real human situation, must take full cognizance of the tremendous forces that are operating at the present time.
>
> In consequence of the prophetic tradition of biblical religion, and in loyalty to the words of Jesus Christ himself, it is the function of the church to "discern" the times and the seasons, to "decipher the meaning" of each succeeding era and to bear witness to the word and will of God in each concrete situation. In doing so the church will issue a call to repentance in which both church and nation shall acknowledge their separate and corporate guilt before God.
>
> The churches in their purely temporal aspects, and apart from their spiritual functions, are social institutions. As such they must concern themselves at all times in a vital and primary way with social confusion and chaos.

The church will make plain that peace is much more than the cessation or absence of conflict, following upon the joyous commitment of life to a cause greater than individual or national self-interest. In this respect peace is like freedom, both have their origin not in a release from that which disturbs or curbs, but rather an abandonment to the self-transcending demands of a great devotion. The church can most adequately meet man's perennial demand for peace and freedom by summoning men to commit themselves to Jesus Christ and to the cause of the Kingdom of God in him.

We now wish to suggest certain questions whose discussion may well provide a summary of the most important positions taken by the Delaware Conference.

I—Guiding Principles

Is peace ever going to be possible unless all nations recognize that "moral law, no less than physical law, undergirds our world" and that "social and political institutions must be brought into conformity with this moral order"? Do only Christian nations recognize the existence of this moral order? Must the coming of peace wait upon the evangelization of the world?

II—The Relation of the Churches to a Just and Durable Peace

Is the church at war? Can it be broken by human conflicts? Was Delaware right when it declared that "it is the purpose of God to create a world-wide community in Jesus Christ, transcending nation, race and class?" If it is the purpose of God to do this, can that purpose be defeated? May it be defeated by one generation or by many, yet achieved at last?

III—The Political Bases of a Just and Durable Peace

Is peace possible without a world government? Must that government spring full-grown from the peace conference which will follow the war, or is it more likely to come to pass if the beginnings of its functions are recognized in institutions which will develop as the demands upon them increase? Is a partial immediate surrender of sovereignty by the nations participating, with full responsibility of each nation for its internal affairs,

practical? What are the alternatives? Are they workable?

IV—The Economic Bases of a Just and Durable Peace

Can any nation solve its economic problems without "the cooperation in good will of the other peoples of the world"? Does a peaceful interdependence depend upon the establishment of one economic system throughout the world, or does it depend upon the coordination of a variety of systems? What is the role of "the Christian motive of human service" in this process? Is peace possible unless an effort is made progressively to raise the standard of living of the underprivileged peoples of the earth? How can this be done?

V—The Social Bases of a Just and Durable Peace

Does belief that "man is a child of God and all men are brothers one of another" require that we recognize the equality of races before God? Does it demand that equal liberty be granted to each nation? Is equality of opportunity compatible with international peace? What is the alternative?

Recommended Reading

Books

A Christian Imperative. By Roswell P. Barnes. Friendship Press, New York, 1941. A summary of the Christian convictions which make for world peace and good will.

Can Christianity Save Civilization? By W. M. Horton. Harper, 1940. Dr. Horton believes that it can and will. A stimulus to faith.

Christian Alternative to World Chaos. By L. S. Shafer. Round Table Press, New York. 1940. A strong and reasoned insight into the role to be played in world reconstruction by Christian missions.

New Directions in a New World. By A. A. Berle. Harper, 1940. A summary by the Assistant Secretary of State of the situation in which the United States will find itself at the end of the war and what we can do about it.

Peace or War, The American Struggle, 1636-1936. By Merle Curti. W. W. Norton & Company, New York. 1936. This book is the standard history of the American peace movement.

Race, the Modern Superstition. By Jacques Barzun. Harcourt, Brace and Co., 1937.

Religion and the World of Tomorrow. By Walter W. Van Kirk. Willett, Clark & Co., Chicago, $1.50. This book by the secretary of the Delaware Conference and the director of the Federal Council Department of International Justice and Goodwill is the best recent discussion of the principles of a just and durable peace from the point of view of American Protestantism.

The Crisis of Our Age. By Pitirim A. Sorokin. E. P. Dutton & Company, 1941. This book by the head of the department of sociology at Harvard University analyzes the many-sided present crisis, with war as one of its most important aspects. He interprets the crisis as the end of a civilization based on sensate values and the beginning of another founded on spiritual values.

The End of Economic Man. By Peter F. Drucker. John Day Co., New York. 1939. $2.50. The best analysis of the failure of the materialist illusion, capitalist and communist, that man is an economic animal.

The Oxford Conference, Official Report. Willett, Clark and Co., Chicago, 1938. $2.00. The report of the World Conference of Churches held at Oxford, England, in 1937. Of permanent value.

The World Since 1914. By Walter Consuelo Langsam. Macmillan, 1936. 888 pages. Best brief historical summary.

When the War Ends. A series of books by Stuart Chase. Published by The Twentieth Century Fund, New York. $1.00 each. $5.00 for series of six, to be published in 1942 and 1943. Volume I. *The Road We Are Traveling.* Published April 1942. A summary of the causes of the present situation of the United States, including an "inventory of basic trends." Highly recommended for insight into economic and social background.

Pamphlets

A Just and Durable Peace. Data Material and Study Questions. Published by The Commission on a Just and Durable Peace, Federal Council of Churches, 297 Fourth Avenue, New York. Contains the important documents showing the actions of the churches, Protestant and Catholic, on the world crisis beginning with the World Conference of Churches at Oxford in 1937 and ending with 1941.

Commission to Study Organization of Peace, First Report, 1940. (Free) 8 West 40th Street, New York.

Commission to Study the Organization of Peace, Second Report: The Transitional Period. (Free.) A pamphlet dealing from the League of Nations point of view with the problem of post-war reconstruction.

European Agreements for Post-War Reconstruction. By Vera Micheles Dean. Foreign Policy Association, 8 West 40th Street, New York. 25 cents. March 15, 1942.

Foundations of Peace. By Henry A. Wallace. The *Atlantic Monthly,* January 1942. Reprinted by the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 405 West 117th Street, New York. 10 copies free on request.

Guides for Post-War Planning. By the National Planning Association, 1721 Eye Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. November 1941. "To call attention to some of the thinking that is being done about post-war economic policy." Usable for opening discussion.

In Quest of Empire, The Problem of Colonies. By W. C. Langsam. The Foreign Policy Association, 8 West 40th Street, New York. 25 cents. A Headline Book. The best brief summary of the colonial problem. Illustrated. Well adapted for the use of study groups.

Jewish Studies of Peace and Post-War Problems. By Morris R. Cohen. Published by the American Jewish Committee, 386 Fourth Avenue, New York. A 16-page pamphlet on the problems of the peace with emphasis on the issues in which the Jewish people are particularly concerned, such as relief and rehabilitation; migration and colonization; political, economic and cultural status. Printed in April 1941.

Pacifist Living—Today and Tomorrow. A brief exploration of pacifism under conscription, in time of war and in post-war reconstruction. Published by The American Friends Service Committee, 20 South 12th Street, Philadelphia, Pa. A study of areas of positive action in reconciliation and reconstruction at this time, ways of strengthening peace, the problems of pacifism under conscription, working toward government and building a local peace group. The most useful single pamphlet on this subject. 15 cents.

Social Justice and Economic Reconstruction, Towards a Christian Britain. A statement of the commission of the Churches for International Friendship and Social Responsibility, with a Preface by the present Archbishop of Canterbury, chairman of the commission. Published by the Federal Council of Churches, 297 Fourth Avenue, New York. 1942.

Toward World Order. By John Foster Dulles. Merrick-McDowell Lecture delivered at Ohio Wesleyan University, Delaware, Ohio. March 2, 1942. Order from the Federal Council of Churches, 297 Fourth Avenue, New York.

The man who heads the peace forces of American Protestantism lays down the principles upon which the churches are building for a *just and durable peace.*

WALTER W. VAN KIRK is the man, and his book is entitled

RELIGION and the WORLD of TOMORROW

"I consider this the most valuable book I have read which looks toward the future of the world in terms which take full account of the causes of our present plight and relates the Christian faith to the whole world scene. Dr. Van Kirk proves himself to be a statesman of the first order."—CHARLES CLAYTON MORRISON.

"Will be keenly welcomed by all who are eager for the churches to play their full part in the struggle for peace."—*Religious Book Club Bulletin.*

"Deserves to be one of the most widely used basic source-studies of the practical aspects of Christian social action in the international field."—DWIGHT J. BRADLEY.

$1.50

Willett, Clark & Company

37 W. Van Buren St., Chicago

Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries
1 1012 01181 7386

The

CHRISTIAN CENTURY

CHARLES CLAYTON MORRISON
Editor

PAUL HUTCHINSON
Managing Editor

The most powerful journalistic v within the Christian Church.

"The best edited religious weekly in Amer (*Time* Magazine)

"I don't see how any alert and forward-looking tian can do without The Christian Century in day these."—ALBERT W. PALMER.

"You are giving to thousands as you are giving to m sustenance without which I should find it difficult to —JOHN HAYNES HOLMES.

"I thank God every day for The Christian Centu is a rock in a weary land."—ALBERT E. DAY.

"How different would be the face and spirit of the tian church if there were no 'Christian Century' fearless and intelligent leadership is acknowledged a the world."—E. STANLEY JONES.

Special Short-Term Acquaintance Subscription

17 weeks for $1.00

$4.00 a year

Send orders to

The Christian Century

407 S. Dearborn St., Chicago, Ill.

D 816 .C48 1942

The churches and a just and
durable peace